

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XCIV. JANUARY 1899.

ART. I.—INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

1. *Charge delivered at his First Visitation.* By FREDERICK, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. (London, 1898.)
2. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lichfield.* By AUGUSTUS LEGGE, D.D., Bishop of Lichfield, at a Visitation held in the Cathedral Church of Lichfield, September 20, 1898. (London and Lichfield, 1898.)
3. *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum de justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum, Christo mediatore, et Eucharistia.* Per GULIELMUM FORBESII, S.T.D., et episcopum Edinburgensem primum. Opus posthumum diu desideratum. Editio quarta una cum versione Anglica. (Oxonii, tom. i., 1850 ; tom. ii., 1856.)
4. *An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles.* With an Epistle dedicatory to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. By A. P. FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. Third edition. (Oxford and London, 1878.)
5. *After Death.* An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead and their Relationship to the Living. By HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely, Principal of the Theological College, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop, and sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. Fourth edition. (London, 1882.)
6. *The Invocation of Saints treated Theologically and Historically.* By HENRY R. PERCIVAL, M.A., D.D., Author of *A Digest of Theology*, *The Doctrine of the Episcopal Church*, *The Glories of the Episcopal Church*, etc. (London, New York, and Bombay, 1896.)
7. *The Times*, 1898.
8. *The Guardian*, 1898.

AMONG the questions to which recent controversies in the Church of England have directed attention is that of the
VOL. XLVII.—NO. XCIV. T

invocation of saints. The custom of seeking the prayers of the saints by the use of words directly addressed to them has during the last few months been condemned by some in high authority as in itself objectionable, and as disloyal to the English Church. On the other hand, there are those who, with a serious sense of responsibility, have admitted into their devotions invocations of the saints, and are convinced that in so doing they have acted with entire loyalty both to the Universal Church and to the part of the Church in which the Providence of God has placed them. And, apart alike from the deliberate condemnation of thinking men, and from the serious and thoughtful action of those who take pains to make their prayers catholic and intelligent, the newspapers have contained many letters full of foolish denunciations of devotions which the writers have apparently never taken the trouble to understand, and have supplied indications that such devotions are being widely used with that light-heartedness which characterizes much religious belief and practice at the present time.

Under these circumstances, it has seemed to us advisable to endeavour to present with some degree of fulness the historical facts and doctrinal teaching without which there cannot be any profitable consideration of this question.

To avoid confusion, let us define that we use the phrase 'invocation of saints' in the sense ordinarily attached to it at the present time: namely, to denote the practice of requesting departed saints for the help of their prayers to God. And to make the point perfectly clear, let us give as an illustration the modern form of the 'Hail Mary':

'Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.'¹

The task before us is to consider the evidence as to the lawfulness and the expediency of methods of devotion of which the 'Hail Mary,' in the form in which we have quoted it, is representative.

A necessary preliminary to the consideration of invocation

¹ The first part only of this devotion, ending with the word 'Jesus,' appears to have been in use in England in the middle ages. This shorter form was in most editions of the *Sarum Breviary* and in the *Primer* (see e.g. Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia ecclesie Anglicane*, ii. 176). The longer form, as given above, is in the *Sarum Breviary* of 1531; see, e.g., Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesie Sarum*, ii. 2.

of sai
comp
respec
'pray
comp
addre
an ar
St. St

'A
the m
besee
may s

C
that t
Indec
Testa
befor
repre
ness;
of Go
depar
woul
the s
paral
of re
death
paral
hard
repro
penit
does
of u
unse
show
He p
slain

1
Steph
assist
The
differ
Mag

4
6

of saints is some treatment of what is ordinarily known as comprecation of saints. This differs from invocation in the respect that, while in invocation the words 'pray for us' or 'pray for me' are directly addressed to the saint or saints, in comprecation the request for the prayers of the saints is addressed to God. To quote again a representative instance, an ancient prayer of the Latin Church on the feast of St. Stephen ran thus

'Almighty and eternal God, who didst dedicate the firstfruits of the martyrs in the blood of thy holy deacon Stephen, grant, we beseech thee, that he who made supplication even for his persecutors may stand before thee as our intercessor.'¹

Christian thought has continuously clung to the belief that the souls of the departed are in a state of consciousness. Indeed, indications of this fact were not wanting in the Old Testament. In spite of the gloom which surrounded death before the resurrection of our Lord, both Isaiah² and Ezekiel³ represent the disembodied souls as still retaining consciousness; and our Lord taught the Sadducees that the description of God in the book of Exodus as the God of those who had departed this life was a sign that they were alive and, it would seem, conscious also.⁴ The New Testament shows the same truth with greater clearness. The imagery of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, depicting a condition of receiving comfort and a state of being in torment between death and the end of the world,⁵ however little the details of parabolic language may in some cases be pressed, could hardly have been employed if our Lord had not intended to represent the departed as still conscious. The promise to the penitent robber, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,'⁶ does not suggest that after death his soul would be in a state of unconsciousness. The preaching of our Lord in the unseen world between His crucifixion and His resurrection⁷ shows that His human soul and the souls of those to whom He preached were conscious. The 'souls of them that were slain for the word of God' which St. John 'saw under the

¹ 'Omnipotens aeternae Deus, qui primitias martyrum in sancti levitae Stephani sanguine dedicasti, tribue, quaesumus, ut pro nobis intercessor assistat, qui pro suis etiam persecutoribus supplicavit : ' see, e.g., Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, p. 6. The same prayer, with slight verbal differences, is also in the Gregorian Sacramentary; see, e.g., St. Greg. Mag. t. iii. col. 10 (ed. Bened.).

² Isa. xiv. 9-10.

³ Ezek. xxxi. 16-17.

⁴ Ex. iii. 6; St. Matt. xxii. 29-32.

⁵ St. Luke xvi. 19-31.

⁶ St. Luke xxiii. 43.

⁷ 1 St. Peter iii. 18-20.

altar'¹ were in a state of conscious activity, and the retention of consciousness is implied by St. Paul's description of his anticipated condition after death as being 'to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.'² Following the teaching thus contained in Holy Scripture, the writers of the early Church habitually regarded the souls of the departed as being in the possession of conscious life.

In the early Church it does not appear to have been ever doubted that in the case of the holy dead to retain consciousness was to retain the power of prayer. It would be almost inconceivable that those who in this life had learned to exercise their spiritual capacities in dependence upon God should on passing through death cease to be able to pray. The souls whom St. John saw under the altar were engaged in prayer. The general sense of Christian thought was well expressed by St. Jerome when he wrote :

'if the Apostles and Martyrs, while still in the body, are able to pray for others when they still ought to be full of care for themselves, how much more can they do so after they have been crowned in victory and triumph. One man, Moses, obtains pardon from God for six hundred thousand armed men, and Stephen, the imitator of his Lord and the first martyr in Christ, begs forgiveness for his persecutors ; and shall their power be less after they have begun to be with Christ ?'³

Indeed, so widespread has been this belief, that the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon of 451 exclaimed that the martyr Flavian was praying for them,⁴ and the 'Saxon Confession' of 1651 declared, 'There is no doubt that the blessed pray for the Church.'⁵ And for those who looked on the saintly dead as conscious and as capable of prayer it would be a natural inference that it was right to plead with God for the benefit of their intercessions.

Accordingly, we find that all the evidence from the teaching and practice of the early Church tends to show the existence of belief in the lawfulness and utility of asking God for the benefit of the prayers of the saints. To quote the Liturgy of St. James as an instance of liturgical practice, the

¹ Rev. vi. 9-10.

² Phil. i. 23.

³ St. Jer. *C. Vigilantium*, 7, 'Si apostoli et martyres adhuc in corpore constituti possunt orare pro cæteris, quando pro se adhuc debent esse solliciti, quanto magis post coronas, victorias et triumphos ? Unus homo Moyses sexcentis millibus armatorum impetrat a Deo veniam, et Stephanus imitator Domini sui et primus martyr in Christo pro persecutoribus veniam deprecatur ; et postquam cum Christo esse cœperint, minus valebunt ?'

⁴ *Conc. Chalc.* Actio xi. (Hardouin, *Concilia*, ii. 556 D).

⁵ *Saxon Confession*, 22 ; see, e.g., *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 311.

priest
Virgin
proph
first m
'not th
that th
turn m
mercy

To qu
Myste
in the
to the
of the

'T
before
would

And t
for th
a mea
in an
earlie
Again
undis
of pr
Chris
to us.

O
saints
first t
little
mean

¹ S
σθῆναι
δεσποί
αἰῶνος
ἀλλ' ἵν
νεύσω
εἰς εὐκ
388, 4
additi
genera
by con
Jerusa

² S
πρωτο
αὐτῶν

priest is there directed, after commemorating the Blessed Virgin, St. John the Baptist, the apostles and evangelists, the prophets and patriarchs, St. Stephen, 'the first deacon and first martyr,' and all the saints, to go on to say

'not that we are worthy to make mention of their blessedness, but that they also standing before Thy terrible and awful throne may in turn make mention of our sad state, and that we may find grace and mercy in Thy sight, O Lord, to help us in time of need.'¹

To quote St. Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechetical Lectures on the Mysteries* as an indication of the teaching given at Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century, he explains the reference to the saints in the Liturgy as a prayer to God for the help of their intercessions:

'Then we make mention also of those who have fallen asleep before us, first, of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God would at their prayers and intercessions receive our supplication.'²

And there is no trace of any doubt that it was right and wise for the Church on earth to commemorate departed saints as a means of pleading that God would grant to the living help in answer to their prayers. There is indeed an absence of earlier positive testimony than that which we have cited. Against this may be set the consideration that, granted the undisputed facts of the continued life and continued power of prayer of the saints, it is simply an ordinary act of the Christian life to ask God that their prayers may be of service to us.

On the distinct but connected subject of the invocation of saints, there is no direct evidence in Holy Scripture, or in the first two Christian centuries. In the third century there is little more, merely, that is, a passage in Origen of doubtful meaning. In his treatise *On Prayer* Origen, taking as a

¹ See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 56-7: "Ετι μνησθήναι καταξίωσον . . . ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου ὑπερευλογημένης δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας . . . πάντων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀγίων σου· οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν ἄξιοι μνημονεύειν τῆς ἐκείνων μακαριότητος ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ παρυστώτες τῷ φοβερῷ καὶ φρικτῷ σου βήματι ἀντιμνημονεύσωσι τῆς ἡμῶν ἐλπιότητος καὶ εὐρωμεν χάριν καὶ ἔλεος ἐνοπιῶν σου Κύριε εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν. Cf. *ibid.* 73-4, 76, 78, 93-4, 169, 230, 264, 330-1, 388, 406-7, 415, 419, 466. Portions of these passages are probably late additions to the Liturgies. That this is not the case with regard to the general prayer for the help of the intercessions of the saints may be seen by comparing the explanation of the service quoted from St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

² St. Cyr. Jer. *Cat. Myst.* v. 9, Εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων, πρῶτων, πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅπως ὁ θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξῃται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν.

starting-point St. Paul's words, 'I exhort therefore that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men,'¹ limits the use of 'prayer' to words addressed to God,² and says of 'supplications,' 'intercessions,' and 'giving of thanks:'

'it is not improper to address these to saints, and two of them, I mean intercession and thanksgiving, not only to saints but also to men, but supplication only to saints, as for instance to some Paul or Peter, that they may aid us, making us worthy to obtain the power granted unto them for the forgiveness of sins.'³

On the ground of the general structure of the passage and of a statement made elsewhere by Origen that

'every supplication and prayer and intercession and thanksgiving is to be sent up to the supreme God through the High Priest, who is above all the angels, the living Word and God,'⁴

the 'saints' referred to have been interpreted by some writers to be living saints.⁵ On the other hand, so competent a critic as Mr. Bigg, who has brought to the close study of Origen's language and thought great insight and impartiality, expresses his opinion that

'Origen no doubt regarded this kind of prayer as lawfully offered to saints, whether on earth or in heaven.'⁶

After Origen, the earliest evidence bearing on the subject is probably a passage in the oration of St. Gregory of Nazianzus delivered as a panegyric upon St. Cyprian, in which it is told that the virgin Justina was assailed by the magician Cyprian, here identified with the great Bishop of Carthage before his conversion, and in her distress,

'despairing of every other means of help, fled to the protection of God, and took as her defender against the hateful lust her own

¹ 1 St. Tim. ii. 1.

² This is not the place to discuss whether Origen's restriction of the offering of 'prayer' in the strict sense to the Father implied any disbelief in the true Deity of the Son.

³ Origen, *De Oratione*, 14, δέσιν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν οὐκ ἄποπον καὶ ἀνθρώποις [*'Lego cum Bentleio: ágióis, Delarue in loco*] προσευχεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν δύο, λέγω δὲ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, οὐ μόνον ἁγίοις, ἀλλὰ διὰ καὶ ἀνθρώποις· τὴν δὲ δέσιν μόνον ἁγίοις, εἰ τις εὐρεθῇ Παῦλος ἢ Πέτρος ἵνα ὠφελήσωσιν ἡμᾶς ἁγίους ποιῶντες τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς δεδομένης αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίας πρὸς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀφιέναι.

⁴ Origen, *C. Celsum*, v. 4, Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέσιν καὶ προσευχὴν καὶ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπεμπτόν τῳ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως, ἐμφύχου λόγου καὶ Θεοῦ.

⁵ See, e.g., Luckock, *After Death*, pp. 187-8.

⁶ Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 185, note 1.

bridegroom, who delivered Susanna and preserved Thecla, the one from the cruel elders, and the other from the tyrannous suitor and her still more tyrannous mother, that is, her bridegroom Christ ;

and

' beseeching the Virgin Mary to help a virgin in danger,'

was delivered from her peril.¹

It may be doubted whether the facts here described are accurately narrated, or whether, if the events took place as thus recorded, much could be based on an isolated instance of the practice of invocation on the part of one Christian virgin in dire distress ; but the passage at least shows that St. Gregory of Nazianzus saw no improbability in a story of a Christian in the first half of the third century seeking the aid, in one form or another, of the holy Mother of our Lord.

About the practice of St. Gregory of Nazianzus himself there is no doubt. In addition to other invocations elsewhere, he addresses St. Cyprian at the end of the oration already quoted :

' Do thou look down on us propitiously from above and direct our speech and life, and be a shepherd or a co-shepherd to this holy flock ; and directing the rest, as far as may be, for the best, and driving away the grievous wolves, the hunters of syllables and phrases, and bestowing on us a more perfect and brighter illumination of the Holy Trinity, in Whose presence thou standest, to Whom we give worship and glory.'²

That it was the help of prayer which was thus sought from St. Cyprian by St. Gregory of Nazianzus may be seen from his address to St. Basil in another oration :

' Do thou, divine and sacred one, look down upon us from above, and by thy intercessions either stay the thorn in the flesh given us by God, our discipline, or persuade us to endure it bravely, and direct our whole life for us for the best ; and, if we be removed hence, receive us in thy tabernacles that, living together and together beholding more

¹ St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxiv. 10-11, πάντων ἀπογνοῦσα τῶν ἄλλων, ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν καταφεύγει καὶ προστάτην ποιεῖται κατὰ τοῦ μισητοῦ πύθου τὸν ἑαυτῆς νυμφίον, ὃς καὶ Σωσάνναν ἐρρύσατο καὶ Θέκλαν διέσωσεν, τὴν μὲν ἀπὸ πικρῶν πρεσβυτέρων, τὴν δὲ ἀπὸ τυράννου μισητοῦ καὶ τυραννικωτέρας μητρὸς· τίνα τοῦτον ; Χριστὸν . . . ταῦτα καὶ πλείω τούτων ἐπιφεμίζουσα καὶ τὴν παρθένον Μαρίαν ἱκετεύουσα βοηθῆσαι παρθένην κινδυνεύουσα, κ.τ.λ.

² *Ibid.* 19, σὺ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐποπτεύεις ἀνωθεν ἰλεως καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον διεξάγεις λόγον καὶ βίον καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦτο ποίμνιον ποιμαίνεις ἢ συμπομαίνεις τὰ τε ἄλλα εὐθύνων ὡς οἶόν τε πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον καὶ τοὺς βαρεῖς λύκους ἀποπεμπόμενος τοὺς θηρευτὰς τῶν συλλαβῶν καὶ τῶν λεξέων, καὶ τὴν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος ἑλλαμψιν, ἧς σὺ νῦν παραστάτης, τελεώτερον τε καὶ λαμπροτέραν ἡμῖν χαρίζομενος, ἣν προσκυνούμεν, ἣν δοξάζομεν.

clearly and more completely the holy and blessed Trinity, of which we have now in some degree received the image, our longing may at last be satisfied, and we may gain this recompense for the battles we have fought and the attacks we have endured.¹

St. Basil the Great, the contemporary of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and thus after death invoked by him, not only calls the Forty Martyrs 'co-operators in prayer' in a rhetorical address to them,² but expressly declares what his own practice is, and the object at which it aims :

'I accept also the holy apostles, prophets, and martyrs, and I call upon them for their intercession to God, that by them, that is by their mediation, the good God may be propitious to me and that I may be granted redemption for my offences.'³

St. Gregory of Nyssa invokes the martyr Theodore :

'Ask for peace, that these assemblies may not cease, that the frantic and lawless barbarian may not rage against temples and altars, that the profane may not tread under foot that which is holy ;'⁴

and addresses St. Ephraem :

'Do thou, standing by the divine altar, and ministering in company with angels to the all-holy Trinity, the source of life, remember all of us, asking for us remission of sins and enjoyment of the eternal kingdom.'⁵

St. Chrysostom exhorts Christians :

'Let us flee to the intercessions of the saints and let us beseech them to pray for us ;'⁶

¹ St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xliiii. 82, σὺ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐποπτεύεις ἄνωθεν, ὦ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ, καὶ τὸν δεδομένον ἡμῖν παρὰ Θεοῦ σκόλοπα τῆς σαρκὸς, τὴν ἡμετέραν παιδαγωγίαν, ἣ στήσῃς ταῖς σπαντοῦ πρεσβείαις ἢ πείσαις καρτερῶς φέρειν· καὶ τὸν πάντα βίον ἡμῖν διεξάγεις πρὸς τὸ λυσιτελέστατον. εἰ δὲ μετασπῃνται, δέξαιο κῆκεῖν ἡμᾶς ταῖς σπαντοῦ σκηναῖς, ὡς ἂν ἀλλήλοις συζῶντες καὶ συνεποπτεύοντες τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μακαρίαν Τριάδα καθαρώτερόν τε καὶ τελειώτερον, ἧς νῦν μετρίως δεδέγμεθα τὰς ἐμφύσεις ἐνταῦθα σταίημεν τῆς ἐφέσεως καὶ ταύτην λάβοιμεν ὡς πεπολεμηκάμεν καὶ πεπολεμημένα τὴν ἀντίδοσιν.

² St. Basil, *Hom. in Quadraginta Martyres*, 8, δέησεως συνεργοί.

³ *Ibid.* *Ep.* ccclx. (al. ccv.), δέχομαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἀποστόλους, προφῆτας, καὶ μάρτυρας, καὶ εἰς τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ἱκεσίαν τοὺτους ἐπικαλοῦμαι, τοῦ δι' αὐτῶν, ἡγουν διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας αὐτῶν, ἰλεῶν μοι γενέσθαι τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεόν, καὶ λύτρον μοι τῶν πταισμάτων γενέσθαι καὶ δοθῆναι. The genuineness of this epistle has been doubted.

⁴ St. Greg. Nyss., *De S. Theodoro Mart.* (t. iii. p. 585, Paris, 1638), αἰτήσον εἰρήνην ἵνα αἱ πολυηγόρευς αὗται μὴ λήθωσιν, ἵνα μὴ κομῶσιν κατὰ νῶαν καὶ θυσιαστηρίων λυσσῶν καὶ ἄθεσμος βάρβαρος, ἵνα μὴ πατήσῃ τὰ ἅγια βέβηλος.

⁵ *Ibid.* *De vita S. patr. Ephraem. Syr.* (t. iii. p. 616), σὺ δὲ τῷ θείῳ παριστάμενος θυσιαστηρίῳ καὶ τῇ ζωάρχῃ καὶ ὑπεραγίᾳ λειτουργῶν σὺν ἀγγέλοις Τριάδι, μέμνησο πάντων ἡμῶν αἰτούμενος ἡμῖν ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεσιν αἰώνιον τε βασιλείας ἀπόλυσιν.

⁶ St. Chrys. *In Genes. Hom.* xliv. 2, καταφεύγωμεν μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἁγίων πρεσβείας καὶ παρακαλῶμεν ὥστε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δεηθῆναι.

and, in the course of a description of the greatness of the kingdom of Christ, says :

'The tombs of the servants of the Crucified are more splendid than the palaces of kings, not for the greatness and beauty of the buildings alone, though even here they surpass them, but, what is far more, in the zeal of those who frequent them. For even he who is clad in the purple himself goes to embrace those tombs, and laying aside his pride, stands entreating the saints to be his advocates with God, and he who has the diadem begs the tent-maker and the fisherman, even now that they are dead, to be his patrons.'¹

St. Ephraem the Syrian addresses the martyrs :

'Victorious martyrs . . . intercede, ye holy ones, on behalf of us who are vain and sinners and full of sloth, that the grace of Christ may come upon us and enlighten the hearts of all the slothful that we may love Him.'²

'Be ye intercessors before the throne for me who am vain, that I may be found there, being saved by the help of your intercessions through the grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ;'³

and invokes St. Basil :

'Intercede for me, who am most miserable, and recall me by thy intercessions.'⁴

There is like evidence from the West as from the East. St. Ambrose teaches :

'Martyrs are to be besought, whose patronage we seem to claim for ourselves by having their bodies as a kind of pledge. They who washed away whatever sins they had in their own blood are able to entreat for our sins ; for they are God's martyrs, our leaders, the spectators of our life and actions. Let us not be ashamed to employ them as intercessors for our weakness, because they themselves have known the weaknesses of the body, even when they overcame.'⁵

¹ St. Chrys. *In Ep. ii ad Cor. Hom.* xxvi. 5, οἱ τάφοι τῶν δούλων τοῦ σταυρωθέντος λαμπρότεροι τῶν βασιλικῶν εἰσιν αὐλῶν, οὐ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων μόνον, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν γὰρ κρατοῦσιν, ἀλλ', ὁ πολλὰ πλέον ἐστὶ, τῇ σπουδῇ τῶν συνιόντων· καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ὁ τὴν ἀλουργίδα περικείμενος ἀπέρχεται τὰ σήματα ἐκεῖνα περιπτυσσόμενος, καὶ τὸν τύφον ἀποθέμενος ἕστηκε δεόμενος τῶν ἁγίων ὥστε αὐτοὺς προστῆναι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τοῦ σκηνοποιοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀλιεύς προστατῶν καὶ τετελευτηκότων δεῖται ὁ τὸ διάδημα ἔχων.

² St. Eph. Syr. *Enc. in Mart. (Opera Græca, t. iii. p. 251, Rome, 1743-1746)*, ἀθλοφόροι μάρτυρες . . . προσβέυσσατε ἅγιοι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν χαυνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ μεστῶν ραθυμίας ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἡ χάρις τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ φωτισμὸς καρδίας πάντων τῶν ραθύμων, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγαπώμεν.

³ *Ibid.* (p. 254), γίνεσθε οὖν προσβευταὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τοῦ χαύνου ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος, ὅπως εὐρεθῶ ἐκεῖ δι' ὑμῶν προσβειῶν σωζόμενος χάριτι τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

⁴ *Ibid. Enc. in Magn. Bas.* (t. ii. p. 296), πρέσβεε ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τοῦ σφόδρα ἐλκενοῦ καὶ ἀνακαλεσαί με ταῖς προσβείαις σου.

⁵ St. Ambrose, *De Viduis*, 55, 'Martyres obsecrandi, quorum videmur

St. Augustine describes the benefit of the burial of Christians at the memorials of the Saints as being that the living may be reminded to commend the souls of the departed to those who are thus kept in remembrance;¹ and, like others of the Fathers, is evidently without the slightest doubt that recourse to the prayers of the martyrs has led to wonderful results.²

St. Jerome invoked Paula in the words

‘Help with thy prayers the extreme old age of thy devotee. Thy faith and thy work join thee to Christ; being in His presence, thou wilt more easily obtain that which thou dost ask.’³

Such evidence is sufficient to show that at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth, it was the ordinary Christian belief in the East and in the West, that it is lawful and expedient to address to the saints supplications for the benefit of their prayers to Almighty God.

An attempt has been made to lessen the import of this evidence, so far as St. Chrysostom, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and St. Ambrose are concerned, on the ground that these writers speak elsewhere of the necessity of prayer being addressed only to God. The probability is that these other statements refer to prayers for direct help as distinguished from requests for prayer for the help of God, and, in any case, it has been allowed that the testimony of St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ephraem the Syrian, and St. Augustine in favour of the practice of invocation is ‘unshaken.’⁴

We have seen that St. Gregory of Nazianzus, while elsewhere specifying that the help sought from the saint was the help of prayer, addressed St. Cyprian in the words, ‘direct our

nobis quodam corporis pignore patrocinium vindicare. Possunt pro peccatis rogare nostris, qui proprio sanguine, etiam si qua habuerunt peccata, laverunt; isti enim sunt Dei martyres, nostri præsules, speculatores vitæ, actuumque nostrorum. Non erubescamus eos intercessores nostræ infirmitatis adhibere; quia ipsi infirmitates corporis, etiam cum vincerent, cognoverunt.’

¹ St. Augustine, *De cura gerend. pro mortuis*, 6, ‘Cum itaque recolit animus ubi sepultum sit carissimum corpus et occurrit locus nomine martyris venerabilis, eidem martyri animam dilectam commendat recordantis et precantis affectus’ (‘When the mind calls up where the body of the loved one is buried and the place known by the name of the venerable martyr suggests itself, the love of him who remembers and prays commends the loved soul to the same martyr’).

² *Ibid.* *Serm.* cccxxiv.; *De Civit. Dei*, xxii. 8; cf. *C. Faust.* xx. 21; cf. St. Greg. Nyss. *Oratio in Quadraginta Martyres* (t. ii. pp. 211-2).

³ St. Jerome, *Ep.* cviii. 33, ‘Vale, O Paula, et cultoris tui ultimam senectutem orationibus juva. Fides et opera tua Christo te sociant, prærens facilius quod postulas impetrabis.’

⁴ Luckock, *After Death*, p. 197.

speech and life.' Similar requests to the saints came to be customary. A typical instance may be seen in a hymn which passed into the office of the Western Church, in which the Mother of our Lord was entreated :

'Virgin all excelling,
Gentle past our telling,
Pardoned sinners render
Gentle, chaste, and tender.
In pure paths direct us,
On our way protect us,
Till, on Jesus gazing,
We shall join thy praising.'¹

Another instance is found in the Antiphon said after Compline during part of the year according to the Roman Breviary :

'Hail, Queen, Mother of pity ; hail, our life, delight, and hope. To thee, in our exile do we, the children of Eve, cry. To thee we sigh, groaning and weeping in this valley of tears. Ah, then, our advocate, turn on us thy pitiful eyes. And, after this exile, show unto us Jesus the blessed fruit of thy womb. O merciful, O holy, O sweet Virgin Mary.'²

Side by side with many devotions of which we have quoted two representative instances, there have been the explanations of theologians, that the saints have knowledge of such supplications because of their vision of God and of His revelation to them, and that the help sought is afforded by means of prayer to God. Their knowledge, St. Gregory the

¹ 'Virgo singularis,
Inter omnes mitis,
Nos culpis solutos
Mites fac et castos.
Vitam praesta puram :
Iter para tutum,
Ut videntes Iesum,
Semper collatetur.'

'This hymn' ('Ave maris stella'), 'so well known as to its words, is of uncertain authorship. It has been wrongly ascribed to St. Bernard, as it is found in a St. Gall MS., No. 95, of the ninth century, and to Venantius Fortunatus (by M. A. Luchi, 1789), but on insufficient authority.' Julian, *Dictionary of Hymnology*, p. 99.

² 'Salve, Regina, mater misericordiae ; vita, dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve. Ad te clamamus exules, filii Evae. Ad te suspiramus, gementes et flentes in hac lacrymarum valle. Eia ergo, advocata nostra, illos tuos misericordes oculos ad nos converte. Et Jesum, benedictum fructum ventris tui, nobis post hoc exilium ostende. O clemens, O pia, O dulcis Virgo Maria.' For the history of this antiphon see Julian, *Dictionary of Hymnology*, pp. 991-2.

Great teaches, is derived from their vision of the 'glory of Almighty God.'¹

'As to the angels,' writes Peter Lombard, 'so also to the saints, who stand before God, our petitions are made known in the Word of God whom they contemplate.'²

'It is manifest,' says St. Thomas Aquinas, 'that they know in the Word the vows and devotions and prayers of men who seek their aid. . . God alone knows of Himself the thoughts of the hearts, but none the less others know them in so far as revelation is made to them either by the vision of the Word or in some other way.'³

'We seek,' he writes elsewhere, 'from the Holy Trinity that God may have mercy upon us; we seek from whatever saints we address that they pray for us. . . The petitions which we direct to them they know by the manifestation of God.'⁴

'God alone,' explains Bellarmine, 'knows all the thoughts of all hearts, and that naturally and by His own power; but the saints only know those thoughts which are made manifest to them by God, whether by the Beatific Vision or even by a new revelation.'⁵

'It is not lawful,' he says in the same treatise, 'to seek from the saints that they, as authors of divine benefits, would grant glory or grace or other means to beatitude. . . When we say that nothing ought to be sought from the saints except that they pray for us, we are not treating about words, but about the sense of the words. For, so far as the words go, it is lawful to say, "Saint Peter, have mercy on me, save me, open to me the gates of heaven, or give me health of body, give patience, give fortitude," &c., provided we understand, "Save me and have mercy upon me by praying for me, grant to me this and that by thy prayers and merits."⁶

¹ St. Greg. Magn. *Moralia*, xii. 26, 'Quæ intus omnipotentis Dei claritatem vident, nullo modo credendum est quia foris sit aliquid quod ignorent.'

² Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. xlv. 6, 'Sicut enim angelis, ita et sanctis qui Deo assistunt, petitiones nostræ innotescunt in Verbo Dei quod contemplantur.'

³ St. Thom. Aq. *S. T.* Supplement, lxxii. 1, 'Manifestum est quod in Verbo cognoscant vota, et devotiones, et orationes hominum qui ad eorum auxilium confugiunt. . . Cogitationes cordium solus Deus per seipsum novit; sed tamen alii cognoscunt quatenus eis revelatur vel per visionem Verbi vel quocumque alio modo.'

⁴ *Ibid.* II^a. lxxxiii. 4, 'A sancta Trinitate petimus ut nostri misereatur; ab aliis autem sanctis quibuscumque petimus ut orent pro nobis. . . Petitiones quas ad eos dirigimus Deo manifestante cognoscunt.'

⁵ Bellarmine, *De Sanc. Beat.* i. 20, 'Dico solum Deum cognoscere cogitationes omnes omnium cordium, idque naturaliter et propria virtute: sanctos autem solum cognoscere eas quæ a Deo ipsis manifestantur sive beatifica visione sive etiam nova revelatione.'

⁶ *Ibid.* i. 17, 'Non licet a sanctis petere ut nobis tanquam auctores divinorum beneficiorum gloriam, vel gratiam, aliaque ad beatitudinem media concedant. . . Est tamen notandum cum dicimus non debere peti a sanctis nisi ut orent pro nobis nos non agere de verbis sed de sensu verborum, nam quantum ad verba licet dicere: S. Petre, miserere mei, salva me, aperi mihi aditum cæli; item da mihi sanitatem corporis, da patientiam,

The Catechism of the Council of Trent made the same distinction :

'We pray God that He Himself will either give us what is good or set us free from what is evil ; but we seek from the saints, because they are well pleasing to God, that they will become our patrons, that they may obtain for us from God those things of which we have need. Hence we use two forms of prayer of a different kind : for we say properly to God "Have mercy on us, Hear us ;" to the saint, "Pray for us."

And the Catechism was careful, following the same line of thought as Bellarmine, to say that the form, 'Have mercy upon us' could only rightly be addressed to a saint in the sense of 'Have mercy by praying for us.'¹

So, too, in the East, the Russian Bishop Macarius writes :

'In venerating the saints as faithful servants, as righteous men, and as friends of God, the holy Church invokes them in her prayers, not as gods capable of affording us assistance by themselves, but as our intercessors with God, who is the only author and dispenser of every gift and every grace to all His creatures.'²

And in the Greek Catechism of Bernardaces, in reply to the question

'Do we sin against this' [the first] 'commandment because we invoke the Holy Theotokos and the other saints?'

the answer is given

'We do not sin, because we do not make gods of these saints, but only invoke them to intercede for us with God.'³

These are the careful distinctions of theologians. It may be doubted whether the majority of those who in the Middle Ages used such devotions as we have described, or of those who use them now, have thought otherwise than that their words were directly heard by the saint, and that the help afforded included much more than prayer.

da mihi fortitudinem, etc., dummodo intelligamus salva me et miserere mei orando pro me, da mihi hoc et illud tuis precibus et meritis.'

¹ *Cat. Conc. Trid.* IV. vi. 3-4, 'Non enim eodem modo Deum et sanctos imploramus. Nam precamur Deum ut ipse vel bona det vel liberet a malis, a sanctis autem, quia gratiosi sunt apud Deum, petimus ut nostri patrocinium suscipiant, ut nobis a Deo impetrent ea quorum indigemus. Hinc duas adhibemus precandi formulas, modo differentes, ad Deum enim proprie dicimus Miserere nobis, Audi nos ; ad sanctum Ora pro nobis.' ² 'Quanquam licet etiam alia quadam ratione petere a sanctis ipsis ut nostri misereantur ; sunt enim maxime misericordes, itaque possumus precari eos ut conditionis nostræ miseria permoti, sua nos apud Deum gratia et deprecatione iuvent.'

³ The above is translated from the French translation of the Russian work : see *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, ii. 660.

³ Bromage, *The Mother of all Churches*, p. 35.

We have hitherto ignored the question, Who, in the judgment of those who have practised invocation of saints, may be invoked? On this point clear distinctions are not found in early theology. By an argument from analogy it may be thought probable that, as the Liturgies and the teaching of St. Cyril of Jerusalem distinguish the great saints from the general body of the faithful departed with a view to asking God for the prayers of the former and to praying for the latter, so invocation would naturally be addressed only to the great saints. Some doubt may be cast on the soundness of this inference, possibly by two passages in the writings of St. Gregory of Nazianzus,¹ and more probably by the general indefiniteness of early theology as to distinctions among the holy dead. In the West the ordinary practice which the Middle Ages inherited from the later patristic period, and bequeathed to the modern Roman Church, was to restrict invocation to the canonized saints. Though the ordinary practice, it has not been regarded as the only possibility; and at the present time there are two schools of thought on the subject among Roman Catholics. St. Thomas Aquinas repudiated the invocation of the souls in purgatory on the grounds that 'they do not yet enjoy the vision of the Word,'² and that 'they are not in a condition of offering prayer.'³ On the other hand, Bellarmine teaches 'there is no doubt that' the souls in purgatory 'pray for themselves,' and 'it is probable that they pray for us.' He thinks it unnecessary under ordinary circumstances to make requests for their prayers, but does not deny the lawfulness of doing so.⁴ And to quote a modern writer, the Jesuit Schouppe thinks the greater probability is in favour of the opinion that 'the

¹ He invokes Constantius and any kings before him who loved Christ with the saving clause 'If thou hast perception' (*εἰ τις ἀισθῆται*): see *Orat.* iv. 3. He invokes his sister Gorgonia with a similar saving clause: see *Orat.* viii. 23. But both these are simply rhetorical addresses differing considerably from the invocations already quoted from St. Gregory of Nazianzus and others.

² St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* II^a. lxxxiii. 4, 'Illi qui sunt in hoc mundo aut in purgatorio nondum fruuntur visione Verbi ut possint cognoscere ea quæ nos cogitamus vel dicimus.'

³ *Ibid.* 11, 'Non sunt in statu orandi.' It may be worth while for those who are interested in St. Thomas's view of the state of the dead to consult Cajetan's commentary on this article of the *Summa*.

⁴ Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio*, ii. 15, 'Non est incredibile etiam animas purgatorii pro nobis orare et impetrare;' 'non videtur dubium quin pro se ipsis orent;' 'probabile est eas pro nobis orare;' 'quamquam hæc vera sint, tamen superfluum videtur ab eis ordinarie petere ut pro nobis orent, quia non possunt ordinarie cognoscere quid agamus in particulari sed solum in genere sciunt nos in multis periculis versari.'

souls in purgatory pray for us,' and describes as probable the view that

'it is lawful to invoke the souls in purgatory as it is lawful to ask for the prayers of holy men who are living on earth, though this is a practice which the custom of the Church has not publicly adopted.'¹

The different view taken by Eastern Christians of the state of the dead and the rejection in the East of the clear cut distinctions between departed souls who are among the saved customary in mediæval Western and modern Roman theology necessarily results in this question as to the persons who may be invoked being regarded altogether differently in the East. Mr. A. C. Headlam has pointed out that the invocation of the faithful departed generally is 'the habitual custom of the Russian Church,' and has illustrated the extent to which this custom is popularly adopted by observing:

'Often, when a child who has lost its mother is praying, he may be heard adding her name to those of the other saints whom he asks to pray for him. Mutual prayer of the dead for the living, of the living for the dead, and of both for the whole Church, is to the Russian the bond which links together the Church in one Communion of Saints.'²

And, as Mr. Headlam has noticed, there is an example of such prayers in a poem by the theologian Khomiakoff which was translated by Mr. W. Palmer:

'Dear children, at that same still midnight do ye,
As I once prayed for you, now in turn pray for me;
Me who loved well the Cross on your foreheads to trace;
Now commend me in turn to the mercy and grace
Of our gracious and merciful God.'³

In Khomiakoff's *Essay on the Unity of the Church* he has explained at some length the theological principle which underlies this practice:

'We know that when any one of us falls, he falls alone; but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all her other members. If any

¹ Schouppe, *Elementa Theologia Dogmaticæ*, xix. 121, 'Probabilis animæ purgatorii orant pro nobis præsertim eas iuvantibus. . . Probabilis quoque est sententia Bellarmini licitum esse animas purgatorii invocare sicut preces piorum hominum in terris viventium licet poscere, quod tamen Ecclesia publice facere non consuevit.'

² Headlam, *The Teaching of the Russian Church*, p. 20, note 2.

³ This poem is quoted in Russian and in Mr. Palmer's English translation in Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church during the last Fifty Years*, pp. 2, 3.

one believes, he is in the communion of faith ; if he loves, he is in the communion of love ; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope on his own prayers, and every one who prays asks the whole Church for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurance that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the angels pray for us, the apostles, martyrs, and patriarchs, and above them all the Mother of our Lord, and this holy unity is the true life of the Church. But if the Church, visible and invisible, prays without ceasing, why do we ask her for her prayers ? Do we not entreat mercy of God and Christ, although His mercy preventeth our prayer ? The very reason that we ask the Church for her prayers is that we know that she gives the assistance of her intercession even to him that does not ask for it, and to him that asks she gives it in far greater measure than he asks : for in her is the fulness of the Spirit of God. Thus we glorify all whom God has glorified and is glorifying ; for how should we say that Christ is living within us, if we do not make ourselves like unto Christ ? Wherefore we glorify the saints, the angels, and the prophets, and more than all the most pure Mother of the Lord Jesus, not acknowledging her either to have been conceived without sin, or to have been perfect (for Christ alone is without sin and perfect), but remembering that the pre-eminence, passing all understanding, which she has above all God's creatures, was borne witness to by the angel and by Elizabeth, and, above all, by the Saviour Himself when He appointed John, His great Apostle and seer of mysteries, to fulfil the duties of a son and to serve her. . . . Mutual prayer is the blood of the Church, and the glorification of God her breath. We pray in a spirit of love, not of interest, in the spirit of filial freedom, not of the law of the hireling demanding his pay.¹

On a subject on which there has been so much rash and ignorant writing, from more points of view than one, as that of the invocation of saints, it may be well, before proceeding to set out the treatment which the matter has received in the Church of England, to quote two authoritative statements, the one of the Church of Rome, the other of the Russian Church.

The decree of the Council of Trent on the invocation of saints declares :

'The saints reigning together with Christ offer their prayers to God on behalf of men, and it is good and useful to invoke them as suppliants and to take refuge in their prayers, support, and help, on account of the benefits to be obtained from God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, Who is our only Redeemer and Saviour ; and those who deny that the saints enjoying eternal felicity in heaven are to be invoked, or who assert that they do not pray for men, or

¹ Birkbeck, *ibid.* pp. 216, 219. The whole passage from which the above is an extract is well worth careful thought.

tha
divid
oppo
men,
ing i

invo

7

offer
the s
on th
cessi
faith
and l
appar

A

the
was
forth
gene
sanct
voca
name
were
saint

and p
unto
heave
that c

1
imag.
munu
centes
bus D
benefi
nostru
opem
felic
homin
tioner
honor
in cæl
Conci

2
(Hard

3
VO

that the invocation of them to obtain their prayers for us even as individuals is idolatry, or that it is contrary to the Word of God and opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ, the one mediator of God and men, or that to supplicate verbally or mentally those who are reigning in heaven is foolish, hold an impious opinion.¹

'All superstition,' the Council added later on, 'in the invocation of saints is to be put down.'²

The *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* asserts :

'The faithful who belong to the Church militant upon earth, in offering their prayers to God, call at the same time to their aid the saints who belong to the Church in heaven ; and these, standing on the highest steps of approach to God, by their prayers and intercessions purify, strengthen, and offer before God the prayers of the faithful living upon earth, and by the will of God work graciously and beneficently upon them, either by invisible virtue, or by distinct apparitions, and in divers other ways.'³

At various points in the history of the Reformation in the Church of England the subject of invocation of saints was necessarily in view. In 1536 the *Articles about religion set forth by the Convocation and published by the king's authority*, generally known as the 'ten articles,' were drawn up and sanctioned by Convocation, signed by the members of Convocation, headed by Thomas Cromwell, and issued in the name of King Henry VIII. Of these the seventh and eighth were entitled 'of honouring of saints' and 'of praying to saints.' They laid down :

'As touching the honouring of saints, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge that saints now being with Christ in heaven be to be honoured of Christian people in earth ; but not with that confidence and honour which are only due unto God, trusting to

¹ Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv. *De invoc., vener., et reliq. sanctorum, et sac. imag.*, 'Mandat sancta synodus omnibus episcopis et ceteris docendi munus curamque sustinentibus ut . . . fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium eius Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere ; illos vero, qui negant sanctos aeterna felicitate in caelo fruantes invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Iesu Christi, vel stultum esse in caelo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire' (Hardouin, *Concilia*, x. 167-8).

² *Ibid.* 'Omnis porro superstitio in sanctorum invocatione . . . tollatur' (Hard. x. 169).

³ Blackmore, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, p. 78.

attain at their hands that which must be had only of God ; but that they be thus to be honoured, because they be known the elect persons of Christ, because they be passed in godly life out of this transitory world, because they already do reign in glory with Christ ; and most specially to laud and praise Christ in them for their excellent virtues which He planted in them, for example, of and by them to such as are yet in this world to live in virtue and goodness, and also not to fear to die for Christ and His cause, as some of them did ; and finally to take them, in that they may, to be the advancers of our prayers and demands unto Christ. By these ways, and such like, be saints to be honoured and had in reverence, and by none other.

‘As touching praying to saints, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge that albeit grace, remission of sin, and salvation cannot be obtained but of God only by the mediation of our Saviour Christ, which is only sufficient Mediator for our sins, yet it is very laudable to pray to saints in heaven everlastingly living, whose charity is ever permanent, to be intercessors, and to pray for us and with us unto Almighty God after this manner: All holy angels and saints in Heaven pray for us and with us unto the Father, that for His dear Son Jesus Christ’s sake we may have grace of Him, and remission of our sins with an earnest purpose, not wanting ghostly strength, to observe and keep His holy commandments, and never to decline from the same again unto our lives’ end : and in this manner we may pray to our blessed Lady, to St. John Baptist, to all and every of the apostles or any other saint particularly, as our devotion doth serve us, so that it be done without any vain superstition, as to think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that any saint doth serve for one thing more than other, or is patron of the same.’¹

In 1537 a commission of bishops and divines under the presidency of Archbishop Cranmer drew up *The Institution of a Christian Man*, commonly known as the ‘Bishops’ Book.’ It was signed by both the archbishops, all the diocesan bishops, and twenty-five doctors. It had no authority from either Convocation or Parliament, and King Henry VIII., though he ordered the reading of some part of it every Sunday for three years, refused to give it any formal sanction. In treating of the third commandment, this book contained the following teaching :

‘We think it convenient that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge that (forasmuch as the gifts of health of body, health of soul, forgiveness of sins, the gift of grace, or life everlasting, and such other,

¹ See, e.g., Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII.* pp. 14-15.

be the
maket
any of
God o
this c
yield m
these g
transgr
God.
for us
such t
no inv
Churc

In
six bi
a stat
revisio
submi
with t
Doctr
be kn
of the
saints
no inv
not o
interc

Th
the ‘
1543
to see
given
their
‘Hav
us eve
natur
us’ m
which
that t

Th
conta
lowed

1 C
can be
further

2 L
3 I

be the gifts of God and cannot be given but by God) whosoever maketh invocation¹ to saints for these gifts, praying to them for any of the said gifts, or such like (which cannot be given but by God only), yieldeth the glory of God to His creature, contrary to this commandment. For God saith by His prophet, I will not yield my glory to any other. Therefore they that so pray to saints for these gifts, as though they could give them, or be the givers of them, transgress this commandment, yielding to a creature the honour of God. Nevertheless, to pray to saints to be intercessors with us and for us to our Lord for our suits which we make to Him, and for such things as we can obtain of none but of Him, so that we make no invocation¹ of them, is lawful and allowed by the Catholic Church.²

In 1540 a commission, consisting of the two archbishops, six bishops, and twelve doctors, was appointed to draw up a statement of doctrine. In 1543 they had completed a revision of *The Institution of a Christian Man* which was submitted to and approved by Convocation and published with the authority of the king under the title of *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*. It came to be known as the 'King's Book.' It repeated the instruction of the 'Bishops' Book' on the subject of the invocation of saints, with the exception that the phrase 'so that we make no invocation of them' was altered into 'so that we esteem not or worship not them as givers of those gifts, but as intercessors for the same.'³

Thus, the attitude taken up in the 'ten articles' of 1536, the 'Bishops' Book' of 1537, and the 'King's Book' of 1543 was clear and consistent. It was declared to be unlawful to seek from the saints those good things which can only be given by God; it was declared to be lawful to ask them for their prayers. In conformity with such teaching the words 'Have mercy upon us,' or 'grant us grace,' or 'bestow on us everlasting life,' could only be addressed to a saint if their natural meaning was explained away; the words 'Pray for us' might rightly be addressed to a saint. This is a position which, it is well to observe, is in substantial agreement with that taken up in the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

The Latin and English Litanies of the Middle Ages had contained long lists of the names of saints, each name followed by 'Pray for us.' In 1544 Cranmer, at the king's

¹ On this use of the word 'invocation' to denote requests for what can be given only by God as distinct from requests for prayers, see further on in this article.

² Lloyd, *ibid.* p. 141.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 304-5.

command, revised the old Litanies and produced a form in which the only remaining invocations were:

'Saint Mary, Mother of God our Saviour Jesus Christ, pray for us.

'All holy angels and archangels, and all holy orders of blessed spirits, pray for us.

'All holy patriarchs and prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, and all the blessed company of heaven, pray for us.'¹

In the revision of the service books which went on from 1549 to 1662 and resulted in the present Book of Common Prayer, all invocations of saints were omitted. Of the services thus dealt with, invocations had never formed part of the Order or Canon of the Mass; where elsewhere they occurred they were removed.

In 1553 the 'forty-two articles,' which had been drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer with the help of other bishops, were issued with the intention that they should be subscribed by the clergy. They bore the title *Articles agreed upon by the bishops and other learned men in the synod at London in the year of our Lord God MDLII, for the avoiding of controversy in opinions and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion*; but it is doubtful whether they had received the sanction of Convocation.² The twenty-third article contained the words:

'The doctrine of school authors concerning . . . invocation of saints is a fond thing vainly feigned and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture but rather repugnant to the word of God.'

The 'thirty-eight articles' of 1563 and the 'thirty-nine articles' of 1571 were sanctioned by Convocation and approved by Queen Elizabeth. The twenty-second article was similar to the twenty-third of 1553, but the phrase 'the doctrine of school authors' was altered to 'the Romish doctrine,' which in the Latin version was rendered by '*doctrina Romanensium*,' and the words 'invented' and 'warranty' were used instead of 'feigned' and 'warrant.'

In considering what it was which the compilers of our present Articles thus condemned as 'a fond thing vainly invented,' it is necessary to examine the meaning of two phrases—'invocation of saints' and 'Romish doctrine.'

It has been assumed by very many that the phrase 'invocation of saints' is used in the Article in the same sense as

¹ See e.g. Procter, *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 257.

² On this point, see Dixon, *History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*, iii. 513-7; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, i. 15-20.

that which we have defined as our own way of using it: namely, to denote the addressing of requests to the saints for the help of their prayers. It is very doubtful whether this is the meaning which the compilers of the Article attached to it. In two thoughtful letters which appeared in the *Guardian* for October 5 and November 9, 1898, Mr. Leighton Pullan called attention to the fact that in *The Institution of a Christian Man*, published in 1537, and in Archbishop Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit Challenge*, published in 1624, the phrase 'invocation of saints' was used to denote 'addresses to the saints similar in wording to the adoration which we render to God,' and 'formal and absolute prayers' 'tendered to the saints' as distinguished from 'requests for the prayers of the saints' and 'requests of the same nature with those which are in this kind usually made unto the living.' We have already referred to the passage in the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, published in 1543, in which the word 'invocation' is retained in this sense in one of the two places in which it was so used in the passage we then quoted from *The Institution of a Christian Man*. In the *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ* of Bishop William Forbes of Edinburgh, published in 1658, but necessarily written before the Bishop's death in 1634, while the use of the word 'invocation' varies, a distinction is drawn between 'religious invocation,' or such prayer as can be rightly addressed only to God, and 'mere invocation or addressing of angels and saints to pray God with us and for us,' a practice which 'is not to be condemned either as unlawful or as useless' (ii. 194-5, 210-11). The fact that 'invocation' was used in 1537 and 1543 to denote prayers for gifts of grace such as God only can give, and that some survival of this use remained in the early part of the seventeenth century, shows that it is at least possible that this is the meaning which was attached to it in 1553, 1563, and 1571.

What, then, is the meaning of the other phrase? It is important to notice the change made in 1563 from 'doctrine of school authors' ('scholasticorum doctrina') to 'Romish doctrine' ('doctrina Romanensium'). The statement of Bishop Harold Browne, that to know what this is 'we must consult the decrees of the Council of Trent,'¹ may be set aside by simply observing that the Article with this phrase in it was subscribed by the Upper House of Convocation on January 29, 1563, and the Lower House of Convocation in

¹ Browne, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 517.

February 1563;¹ while the Session of the Council of Trent in which this subject was discussed did not take place till December 1563.² Since the article was altered so as not to express condemnation of the teaching of the Schoolmen, and could not because of its date have been written or accepted with the decree of the Council of Trent in view, what was the idea which the phrase 'Romish doctrine' ('doctrina Romanensium') was intended to convey? The term 'Romanenses,' Archdeacon Hardwick pointed out, was already in use 'to designate the extreme mediæval party.'³ The change implied, wrote Dean Plumptre, that the condemnation was directed 'against the popular current teaching of the Romish theologians of the time.'⁴ 'Romish doctrine,' say Dr. Maclear and Mr. Williams, was 'an expression used in the sixteenth century to denote the [teaching of the] extreme mediæval party in the Church.'⁵ These statements of moderate and thoughtful men indicate what we believe to be the true meaning of the phrase. The Article, in our judgment, was intended to condemn the practices which had already been condemned in 1537 and 1543 by the 'Bishops' Book' and the 'King's Book,' and to leave open the right or the wrong of the limited practice of asking the saints for the

¹ See e.g. Cardwell, *Synodalia*, ii. 511, 514, 516. That is, 1563 according to our division of the year; it was 1562 according to the old reckoning.

² See e.g. Hardouin, *Concilia*, x. 167. Cf. also Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, ii. 538: 'With regard to the doctrines here condemned, it is important to bear in mind that when the Article was originally drawn up, and even when it was revised and republished in 1563, none of them had been considered by the Council of Trent. The Article cannot, then, have been deliberately aimed at the formal decrees of that Council; and, as a matter of fact, the decrees on these particular subjects, which were published during the last session of the Council in December 1563, were drawn up with studied moderation, and some of the strong language of our Article could hardly be truthfully said to apply to the doctrine as stated in them, though it certainly was not one whit too strong in its condemnation of the current practice and teaching which the Reformers had before them.'

³ Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 410.

⁴ Plumptre, *The Spirits in Prison*, pp. 307-8: 'It was directed, not so much against the formulated statements of Lombard or Aquinas, still less against the earlier teaching of the Greek and Latin Fathers, as against the popular current teaching of the Romish theologians of the time; and so far as the Tridentine decrees, with whatever reserves and limitations, embodied that teaching, they come under that condemnation.' The phrase would perhaps be more accurate if 'popular current Roman teaching' had been used instead of 'popular current teaching of the Romish theologians.'

⁵ Maclear and Williams, *An Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, p. 263.

help of their prayers, which those books had allowed. 'Nothing, I think, can be clearer,' wrote Dr. Hort, 'than that the Article does not condemn all doctrine that may be called a doctrine of purgatory.'¹ And, if it does not condemn every doctrine of purgatory, neither does it condemn every doctrine 'concerning' 'invocation of saints.'²

The Church of England, then, in the course of the Reformation did three things with regard to the invocation of saints. In the first place, she entirely removed any kind of invocation from the service books. Secondly, in the Articles drawn up in order that they might form a statement which the clergy must agree not to contravene in their public teaching, she condemned the extreme practices and ways of thought in which the saints had been called upon to grant boons which are in the power of God alone, and had been given a prominence in devotion which was derogatory to the honour of God. Thirdly, in the same document she left it an open question whether the clergy might express approval of the practice of invocation of saints in the limited sense of seeking from the saints the help of their prayers.

How far was the position thus taken up by the Church of England in accordance with Catholic theology and practice? How far was it wise and expedient? Such a policy was, of course, open to the objections and the attacks which are always likely to assail any form of a *via media*. Romanist and Puritan alike found much to say against the whole attitude adopted by the English Church. To deliberately resolve, as the Church of England did, that, affirming with the greatest clearness and strength the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith, she would leave it possible for differing modes of thought on much which was subsidiary to be held both by her clergy and by her laity, and would allow, to use the Bishop of Rochester's expression, 'men who seemed very near to the Roman and Puritan positions respectively'³ to remain and minister within her fold, was a line of action which almost courted the onslaughts of very different antagonists,

¹ See *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, ii. 336.

² The second part of the Homily concerning Prayer in the Homilies of Queen Elizabeth's reign condemns any kind of invocation of saints. But most of what is said is applicable only to such forms of invocation as infringe the prerogatives of God. On the non-authoritative character of the Homilies see Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, ii. 726-8.

³ See the Bishop of Rochester's letter in the *Times* of September 12, 1898. Part of this letter was quoted in the *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1898, p. 35.

and has at various times strained almost to breaking point the loyalty of sections of Church people. Yet, it has been steadily maintained in official statements when individuals on every side seemed ready to abandon it; the calm judgment, of far-sighted divines set their seal upon it when the Reformation was completed in 1662; it has at least left open possibilities of good which else must have been closed.

Let us examine separately in this particular matter the three parts of the action of the English Church. The first part was the removal of any kind of invocation from the service books. For such a proceeding there was much to be said from two points of view. It was a return to early custom, since for almost six hundred years from the foundation of Christianity no invocations of saints were to be found in the authorized services of the Church. It was a practical necessity of the times if the aim of the English Church to possess a form of public worship which could be used by those who, being agreed upon the essentials of the Faith, differed about much else was to be carried out.

Secondly, the clergy were committed to a strong condemnation of the custom of seeking from the saints gifts which can be bestowed only by God. The need of such a condemnation would be denied by few, and was recognized even by the Council of Trent. 'All superstition,' said the Council, 'in the invocation of saints is to be put down.' That vigorous action was called for may be illustrated from much which, in spite of the Council of Trent and in marked disregard of its teaching, has continued to exist and to be practically authorized in the Church of Rome to the present time. Not to quote so horrible an instance as the well-known *Anima Virginis*, we find in one of the best Roman devotional books, published in Latin, and so not in use among the ignorant, having passed through many editions and been much revised, issued with the approbation of a Cardinal Archbishop, the following prayer:

'O most wise Mother, receive me among thy devotees. Into thy blessed hands and into the bosom of thy pity I commend my soul and my body with filial confidence now and in the hour of my death. Rule, teach, guide, and defend me in all things according to thy will. Look, O Lady, upon the prayers of thy servant, most unworthy though he be: look on all my necessities. To thee I fly as my only refuge: hide me under the covering of thy motherly protection. Do not repel me from thee, O Mother of pity, for without thee my soul cannot live. Amen.'¹

¹ *Cæleste Palmetum*, p. 246 (edition 8, 1884), 'O sapientissima

To quote one other instance, taken almost at haphazard, a French book honoured with a brief from Pope Pius IX., and commended by many cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, puts in the mouth of those who use it words addressed to the holy Mother of our Lord which make their confidence against the hour of death depend upon her aid.¹ Such prayers for the educated, coupled with the state of mind of many ignorant Roman Catholics, supply sufficient justification for a strong condemnation of and resistance to the abuses of the invocation of saints. If a misunderstanding of the strong terms of the English Article has had some share in leading English people to think too little about the saints, the gentler action of the Council of Trent has certainly failed to keep out much which is inconsistent with the language which the Council used.

Thirdly, the Church of England left open the lawfulness and expediency of that limited form of invocation which asks the saints for the help of their prayers. Here, too, we believe that the course taken was wisely chosen. The condemnation of the 'Romish doctrine' provided against any recourse to the saints which infringed upon the prerogatives of Almighty God; in the allowance of invocation in the ordinary sense of the word as now used care was taken not to condemn a custom which had the support of the teaching and practice of great Fathers of the East and of the West. The abuse was strongly condemned; the use was left open.

It has been supposed by some that the prohibition of dealings with the dead in the Old Testament is in itself sufficient proof that any form of invocation of saints is

Mater ! suscipe me in clientulum tuum. In benedictas manus tuas, et in sinum misericordiæ tuæ animam et corpus meum cum filiali fiducia nunc et in hora mortis meæ commendo. Rege, doce, dirige et defende me in omnibus secundum tuam voluntatem. Respice, O Domina, ad servi tui, licet indignissimi, preces ; respice ad omnes necessitates meas. Ad te ego velut unicum asylum meum confugio : sub pallio maternæ protectionis tuæ absconde me. Noli me a te, Mater misericordiæ, repellere ; nam sine te vivere non potest anima mea. Amen.

¹ *Recueil complet des paillettes d'or*, iv. 128, 'A cette heure, ô Marie, Marie que j'ai tant de fois invoquée, soyez près de ma couche ; soyez-y comme y serait ma mère si je l'avais encore ! Peut-être ma langue paralysée ne pourra pas prononcer votre nom, mais mon cœur le redira toujours ! Vous y serez, n'est-ce pas, ô mère de Jésus, ô ma mère ? Je vous appelle maintenant pour l'heure de ma mort. Et cet appel me laisse le calme et la paix. Oui, serais-je seul, seul expirant loin de tout secours, seul sans une main aimée pour me fermer les yeux, je mourrai souriant parce que vous serez là, ô Marie, fidèle à ce rendez-vous que je vous donne ; vous y serez ; je le crois, je l'espère, j'en suis sûr !'

wrong. Not to dwell on the fact that the whole question has been altered by the work of our Lord among the dead,¹ the clearer light thrown upon their state by Christian doctrine, and the teaching of St. Paul about the one Body of the Church,² it must be noticed that the prohibition of the Old Testament was not against seeking for the prayers of the departed, but against endeavouring to obtain information or advice from them. In the Mosaic Law the words are, 'There shall not be found in thee any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or one that obtaineth oracles, or a soothsayer, or one that observeth omens, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or one that consulteth a ghost or a familiar spirit, or one that enquireth of the dead.'³ The words of Isaiah, rebuking the breach of this law, are, 'And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto ghosts and familiar spirits that chirp and mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?'⁴ In both places it is clearly enquiry of the dead which is prohibited or condemned; in both places the right course is shown to be in seeking guidance from God, since in Deuteronomy the prohibition is followed by the promise of the prophet who is to speak in the name of God,⁵ and in Isaiah the condemnation leads on to the command 'To the law and to the testimony.'⁶ Whatever bearing these passages might have on seeking some gifts from the saints, and we doubt whether at all directly they could have any, they have none on seeking the help of their prayers.

The gist of the matter is, What form of invocation, if any, is identical in principle with the practice of 'comprecation,' or praying to God to receive benefit by means of the prayers of saints? If the request addressed to the saint is for his prayers to God, and if it is understood that any knowledge which he possesses of the request is the result of his beholding God or receiving revelation from God, then clearly the making of such request does not in principle differ from prayer addressed to God for the prayers of the saint. If, on the other hand, the request is for gifts which God alone can grant, or if it is supposed that the saint has

¹ See 1 St. Pet. iii. 18-19.

² See especially 1 Cor. xii. 12-27; Eph. i. 22-3, ii. 19-22, iv. 4; Col. i. 18, ii. 16-9. The general imagery of the arena in Heb. xii. 1, though not the phrase *νέφος μαρτύρων*, seems to suggest that the saints of the old covenant have knowledge of some struggles of Christians; but stress cannot rightly be laid on this.

³ Deut. xviii. 10-11.

⁵ Deut. xviii. 15-22.

⁴ Isa. viii. 19.

⁶ Isa. viii. 20.

independent knowledge of the words addressed to him, then, as clearly, such a practice is different in principle from 'comprecation.' It follows that invocation of the former kind is right, and that invocation of the latter kind is wrong.

We believe, then, that each part of the action of the English Church on this subject was thoroughly in accordance with Catholic theology and practice. Further, it was eminently calculated to meet the needs of the times, and to allow for deep-seated characteristics of the human mind. The latter aspect has been admirably treated by Bishop Alexander Forbes, of Brechin, in his *Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles* :

'There will always be,' he says, 'a tendency in human nature to rest in something short of the pure essence of God. His unapproachable holiness bears down upon the human spirit with a crushing weight. Anything that will satisfy the religious instinct, and at the same time prevent the soul from too great a proximity to Him Who is a consuming fire, will be eagerly hailed by those who recognize what God is and what they are, till the correctives supplied by the true faith in the images of love and mercy revealed in the Gospel make themselves living truths within the soul . . . Not merely are there deep principles in the human mind which lead to a resting in secondary worship, but the political condition of a people will strongly influence belief in this respect. It cannot be doubted that the state of the old heathenism, at the time of the state establishment by Constantine, told sensibly in the direction of the development of saint-worship. In Italy, specially, the old Pagan ideas got baptized, and the religious devotion of the vulgar was transformed from the elder forms of heathenism to the purer cultus of the personages of the Holy Gospel and of the Church. That the world gained immensely by the change, the most bigoted religionist must admit. To withdraw the mind from the sensual images that belonged to the beautiful but corrupt Nature-worship of the heathen to those of the self-denying heroism of the martyrs must be acknowledged as an immense gain by all those who hold that the imagination exercises power over the whole man ; but still, beneficial as the process was, it cannot be doubted that it carried a danger within it, and that it laid the foundation of a lower state of things in which a lower standard of religious morality came to be tolerated, and the idea of the one true God to be obscured. . . . At the time of the Reformation all this had specially to be insisted upon. The popularity of some devotions must have been very great if the offerings at St. Thomas's shrine at Canterbury in one year amounted to 934*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.*, while that at our Lord's was nothing, and at our Lady's 4*l.* 1*s.* 8*d.* The gross immorality which was everywhere prevalent found a satisfaction for those spiritual aspirations which never die, even in the bad, in the cultus of some easy saint.

'But there is another aspect of the practice which it would be

uncandid and unphilosophical to pass over. There are certain high-strung souls, of whose undivided and entire love to God there can be no doubt, whose intense personal devotion to our Lord is the warmest, and who realize His Passion in a measure into which our cold hearts cannot enter, to whom this devotion is congenial. In them it exists in entire subordination to the feelings which the incommunicable right of God to our entire selves engenders and cultivates. We may not be able to understand them, but such there are. There must, therefore, be some aspect of this practice which appeals to a very high part of our nature, and therefore well deserves our careful consideration' (pp. 379-82).

And, at the end of the long and careful examination of the evidence, in the preparation of which he had the invaluable help of Dr. Pusey,¹ Bishop Forbes concluded :

'In principle, then, there is no question, herein, between us and any other portion of the Catholic Church. Even where the incommunicable attributes of God have, in expression at least, been invaded, the real underlying belief has been explained to be that nothing is obtained for man, no grace, no aid, no gift for body, soul, or spirit, except through or from the One Mediator between God and man, our adorable Lord, Christ Jesus. Prayer to the saints in heaven is explained, again and again, to be the same *in kind* as the prayers to the saints on earth' (p. 422).

We have written on this subject because of our conviction that a serious examination of it is a need in the Church of England at the present time. Side by side with thoughtful and guarded prayers for the intercessions of the saints there has grown up of late years much that is undesirable and harmful. Devotions are used among ourselves which are not less extravagant than some in use among Roman Catholics. There are those who are cultivating a religious temper which makes it natural that in the hour of death they should commit themselves to the protection of the saints rather than to the mercy of Almighty God.

In view of the present needs of the English Church much which has recently been said or written about the invocation of saints is unsatisfying. It is impossible that the matter should be settled in the off-hand manner in which it has been treated by Canon Gore.² The rash statements sometimes

¹ Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, iv. 146 : 'Pusey revised the Bishop's work throughout, correcting it minutely, besides himself writing the explanation of some of the Articles. He supplied almost the whole of the passages which, under the head of Article XXII., deal with the subject of purgatory and the invocation of saints.'

² See *Guardian*, November 2, 1898, p. 1699, and November 16, p. 1793.

heard in sermons or read in newspapers, and made in defiance of history and Catholic theology, that the invocation of saints, as necessarily involved in the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, is an essential part of the Christian system, are simply mischievous. Nor are indiscriminating assertions of the unlawfulness of the practice, even when they come from episcopal thrones, likely to be profitable. Sweeping condemnations which ignore real differences will convince nobody. Abuses are not met by failing to recognize a lawful use.

The *Church Quarterly Review* has inherited from the Tractarian leaders the habit of looking to the Bishops for help and guidance. And we venture, under the present circumstances, very humbly but very earnestly, to suggest that if the Bishops are to be listened to by those who need to learn caution and restraint, they must really face the facts of history, whether of the early undivided Church or of the Church in England. Both the clergy and the educated laity know perfectly well that the liturgies contain prayers to God for the intercessions of the saints, that great Fathers taught and practised invocation of saints in the ordinary sense of the words, and that a reasonable interpretation of the English Articles of Religion does not force them into condemning what thus has weighty sanction. To ignore these facts, or any one of them, is simply to destroy beforehand the effect of cautions which might else be fruitfully given.

We wish there may be found increasingly in our rulers at the present time the balanced judgment which characterized Bishop William Forbes of Edinburgh, who, at the end of the section on the invocation of saints in his *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ*, wrote :

'Let God alone be religiously adored : let Him alone be prayed to, through Christ, Who is the only and sole Mediator, truly and properly speaking, between God and man. Let not the very ancient custom received in the universal Church, as well Greek as Latin, of addressing the angels and saints after the manner we have mentioned be condemned or rejected as impious, nor even as vain and foolish, by the more rigid Protestants. Let the foul abuses and superstitions which have crept in be taken away. And so peace may thereafter easily be established and sanctioned between the dissentient parties, as regards this controversy, which may the God of peace and of all pious concord vouchsafe to grant for the sake of His only-begotten Son' (ii. 312-13).

ART. II.—ON THE EARLY HISTORY AND MODERN REVIVAL OF DEACONESSSES.

1. *The Ministry of Deaconesses.* By Deaconess CECILIA ROBINSON. With an Introduction by RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Winchester, and an Appendix by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity. (London, 1898.)
2. *Herzog-Hauck's Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.* Vierter Band. Artt. 'Diakonen- und Diakonissenhäuser,' by THEODOR SCHÄFER, and 'Diakonissin,' by HANS ACHELIS. (Leipzig, 1898.)
3. *De diaconis et diaconissis veteris ecclesiæ liber commentarius.* By CASPAR ZIEGLER. (Wittebergæ, 1678.)
4. *Dissertatio de diaconissis primitivæ ecclesiæ.* By JOH. PHIL. ODELEM. (Lipsiæ, 1700.)
5. *Acta Sanctorum Bollandi, &c.* September, Vol. I. 'Tractatus præliminaris de ecclesiæ diaconissis.' By JO. PINIUS. (Parisiis et Romæ, 1868.)
6. *De diaconissis. Commentatio archæologica.* By A. J. C. PANKOWSKI, Penitentiary and Preacher in Passau Cathedral. (Ratisbonæ, 1866.)
7. *Deaconesses ; or the official help of women in parochial work and in charitable institutions.* By J. S. HOWSON, D.D. (London, 1862 ; reprinted, with additions, from the *Quarterly Review* for September 1860.)
8. *Women's Work in the Church.* By J. M. LUDLOW. (London, 1865.)
9. *The Diaconate of Women in the Anglican Church.* Five chapters on the present attitude [*sic*] of the question. By Dean HOWSON. (London, 1886.)

It is a very common thing, as Archbishop Trench long ago pointed out, for words to suffer a certain 'deterioration and degeneration'¹ in meaning. This has unquestionably been the case with the word *deaconess*. It originally denoted a distinct order in the ministry of the Church, having a well-marked *status* (although it may have varied somewhat in different places) and duties more or less clearly defined. In modern days it has come to be used far more loosely, and in fact may now denote anything or nothing.

This is to be accounted for by two distinct causes. In

¹ *On the Study of Words*, p. 77 (eighteenth edition, 1882).

the first place, although an attempt has been made to revive it at the present day (and indeed many would say that it is now in existence), the ancient ecclesiastical office of deaconess has been practically non-existent since the early middle ages. Consequently there has been nothing to keep the accurate meaning of the word before people's eyes. And in the second place, the office of Deaconess, like the parallel office of Deacon, has at all times found favour with bodies out of communion with the Church. Although, of course, these have given it a lax meaning and a *status* which is all their own, they have continually adopted it and used it: partly, no doubt, in not unnatural protest against the gradual disuse of the office within the Church, partly, perhaps, owing to the fact that, having less to imperil, these bodies have always been less careful in controlling and circumscribing women's work than the Church has.

We propose therefore in the first place to make an inquiry as to the nature and history of the ancient office itself, and then to examine in detail the attempts which have been made in modern days to revive and utilise it.

Something must be said, to begin with, as to the existing books on the subject. They are rather numerous, as will be seen from the list at the head of this article.¹ Some of them, however, are exceedingly scarce. Ziegler's classical dissertation, for instance, only the last chapter of which is devoted to the deaconess, is to be found neither in the British Museum nor in the Cambridge University Library. The same is the case with Odelem,² whilst there appears to be no copy of Pankowski in the Bodleian. Again, although much valuable work was done by the older writers, Ziegler and Odelem and Pinius, in the way of collecting material, they cannot be said to have used it very discriminatingly; whilst some of the later writers have written too much as advocates to be in a good position for investigating the facts. Dean Howson, for example, claimed to have collected instances of the early establishment of a female diaconate in the Church 'from various places visited by Christ's Apostle, from Corinth, from

¹ The history of the deaconess has also been treated in its place, and with their wonted learning, by Morinus, Bingham, Assemani, Suicer &c., and in the following works, which the present writer has only glanced at: Schäfer's *Die weibliche Diakonie*, and some papers by A. W. Dieckhoff, entitled 'Die Diakonissen der alten Kirche,' in the *Monatsschrift für Diakonie und innere Mission* for 1877.

² The Bodleian Library possesses three copies of the former and two of the latter.

Ephesus, from Philippi, from Rome,'¹ a feat which he accomplished by including every reference that he could find in St. Paul's Epistles to the work of women. Still, it must not be forgotten that Dr. Howson, by his useful essay and his speeches on the subject, did more than anyone else to make the subject known in the English Church. Dr. Ludlow, that indefatigable friend of all good causes, had written his essay years before Dr. Howson's *Deaconesses* was published, but was unable to secure a hearing until the subject had thus been popularized;² and yet *Women's Work in the Church* is the better book by far, and its seventh section remains to this day the best statement of the position of the deaconess before the Roman law, as in the fullest sense a member of the clerical body.

But the whole subject is not free from difficulty. The word *diaconissa* itself, for example, sometimes means the wife of a deacon, just as *presbyteria* is used to denote the wife of a presbyter, and *episcopissa* for the wife of a bishop.³ But far more confusing than this is the fact that later writers have classed the Deaconess with the Widows and Virgins, and assumed in consequence that whatever is said of the widow may be applied to the deaconess, and *vice versa*. This confusion is made, more or less generally, by most of the writers who have dealt with the subject.⁴ It is made even in the learned article by Dr. Hans Achelis, which was published in the early months of this year;⁵ and it is only in Deaconess Cecilia Robinson's interesting book, the historical chapters of which are largely due to the scholarly care of her brother, Professor Armitage Robinson,⁶ that we have for the first time a succinct and accurate account of the office of the deaconess in early days. No doubt, the book has its faults: the evidence is not always presented as clearly as it might be, and a

¹ *Diaconate of Women*, &c., p. 21. The chief interest of this little volume is to be found in the singularly discordant answers, by well-known scholars, to a series of questions on the subject drawn up by a committee of which Dr. Howson was chairman (pp. 59 sqq.).

² *Women's Work in the Church*, p. viii sq.

³ See Du Cange, *s.v.*; and for *presbyteria* S. Greg. *Dial. lib. iv. c. 11* (Migne, *P. L.* lxxvii. 335).

⁴ Ludlow and Pankowski, it should be said, are free from this confusion, although even they adduce passages which do not really refer to the deaconess at all (*e.g.* the former quotes Tert. *Ad Uxor.* i. 7, and the latter Tert. *De Virg. vel.* 9).

⁵ It is to be regretted that the typography of this article, and indeed of many other parts of the new Herzog, is not equal to its learning. Misprints abound, and unfortunately they are especially common in references.

⁶ *Op. cit.* pp. xvii-xviii.

good deal of later evidence has been overlooked. However, Miss Robinson would probably be the last to make for her book the somewhat arrogant claim that the publishers put forth in their advertisement, that it 'may be regarded as authoritative';¹ and for the rest, she is to be congratulated on having done a very useful piece of work.

We now turn from the books to the subject itself. The Diaconate derives its origin, as we all know, from the appointment by the Apostles of seven men, chosen by the Church, to be over 'the daily ministration.' Other functions gradually clustered about them, in the course of that delegation of functions by the Apostles which gradually gave shape to the whole Christian ministry. By degrees their position 'about the altar,' as it was called, *i.e.* in the Christian ministry, took its later shape; but they never ceased to be especially connected with matters of administration, and to be in an especially close relation of dependence upon the Bishop.

There was, however, no antecedent reason why women should not have a share in their original function of the 'serving of tables,' more especially as the proper care of the widows was the immediate object in view. The very fact that women had ministered to the Lord of their substance might seem to mark them out specially for such an office.² And, indeed, there can be no question that, according to the evidence of the New Testament, the office might be, and actually was, held by women. Phoebe clearly held it;³ and it is not too much to say, in the words of Bishop Lightfoot, that she 'is as much a deacon as Stephen or Philip is a deacon.'⁴ Indeed, it cannot be doubted that in the First Epistle to Timothy we have directions as to the qualifications for the office.⁵ We may not, of course, conclude that women-deacons were to be found everywhere: in fact, we shall give reasons presently for thinking that they only existed in

¹ See the advertisements at the end of the book, p. 4.

² This has at all times been perceived: *e.g.* by the author of the Syriac *Didascalia*, by Abailard, and by the Zwinglian Bullinger (*Decades*, v. 3, p. 107, ed. Parker Society).

³ Rom. xvi. 1: Φοίβην . . . ὡσαν δίακονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κερκεαῖς.

⁴ In his Primary Charge (quoted by Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 10).

⁵ 1 Tim. iii. 11. Bishop Lightfoot observes that this 'would hardly have been rendered "even so must *their wives* be grave," if the theory of the definite article had been understood; for our translators would have seen that the reference is to the γυναῖκες διακόνους, "women-deacons" or "deaconesses," and not to the wives of the deacons' (*On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, p. 114).

VOL. XLVII.—NO. XCIV.

Greece and the East, in regions where the seclusion of women 'debarred them from the ministrations of men.'¹ But there can be no question as to their existence.

Nor do we find in the New Testament any sign of that confusion between the deaconess and the widow which modern writers have been so ready to assume. The widow is indeed there, and no little care is given to the regulations respecting her.² But, to quote Bishop Lightfoot once more, 'the two offices of Deaconess and Widow had different starting-points,' the one being 'distinctly ministerial,' and the other 'distinctly eleemosynary.'³ The widows, in other words, were recipients of the alms, and objects of the care, of the Church; whilst the deaconess existed in order to serve both them and other members of the Church, in such ways as women could serve better than men. Functions of a strictly ecclesiastical kind were by degrees entrusted to them as to the men-deacons; and although later on they were gradually differentiated from these,⁴ yet they continued to form an integral part of the regular ministry of the Church, on a level entirely different from that of the enrolled widows.

It is true, however, that there was a gradual change in the *status* of the widows, and that this change is most marked in the regions where there is no sign of the existence of the deaconess, and where, accordingly, she may have in some sense supplied the place which the deaconess otherwise occupied. Professor Robinson speaks of the widows as 'a numerous and somewhat troublesome body of Church pensioners. Amongst their besetting sins were grumbling at their fellow-widows who happened to get larger doles, and making begging expeditions instead of being content with the supplies which reached them in the normal way.'⁵ This is a somewhat harsh description of the widow as she appears in the *Apostolic Constitutions*: it is a positive libel on the widow in general, and especially as we see her in the West.⁶ For (a) regular functions of prayer, fasting, nursing, and the like, became attached to her office, and brought with it corresponding honour.⁷ (b) The

¹ Lightfoot, 'Essay on the Christian Ministry' (*Philippians*, p. 189, 3rd ed.).

² 1 Tim. v. 3-11.

³ Speech in the Convocation of York in 1884 (Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 59*n.*).

⁴ See *post*, pp. 312-13.

⁵ See his Appendix in *The Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. 176.

⁶ See the evidence given in Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Disciplina*, pars I. lib. iii. cc. 42, 50.

⁷ *Canones Hippolyti*, ix. 59: 'Viduis propter copiosas orationes, infirmorum curam, et frequens ieiunium præcipuus [honor tribuatur].' (*Texte u. Unters.* vi. 4, p. 75, and Achelis's comment, p. 174 *sq.*).

apoc
widow
the V
of th
relati
secre
cient
are c
dema
Tertu
the c
amon
to as
ever
regul
and t
group
made
widow
in ear
the d
a pri
deaco

1
2 A
3 L
4 S
note 8,
P. L.
De Vi
5 C
ieiuner
6 T
xvi. ii.
mission
who ha
in the
proper
facilita
But th
couche
was ne
xv.) an
ordina
mately
cxiii.
356. (br
'vidua
the titl
it clear

apostolical injunction as to the age of enrolment amongst the widows of the church (sixty years¹) tended to be lowered in the West, so that they were, as a class, capable of doing more of this regular work. (c) This also brought them into closer relations with a body of rather more recent growth, the consecrated virgins. It has indeed been suggested, without sufficient proof, that St. Ignatius's salutation to 'the virgins who are called widows'² implies that even in his days the line of demarcation between the two had been broken down; and Tertullian actually mentions,³ though as a monstrous thing, the case of a virgin of twenty years who had been enrolled amongst the widows in 'a certain place.' It would be rash to assume that the qualification of actual widowhood was ever dispensed with as an ordinary thing; but it is clear that regularly defined duties came to be entrusted to the widows,⁴ and that, in some places at least, they and the virgins were grouped together.⁵ But although a plausible case might be made out for the theory that the line of demarcation between widows and virgins was broken down, there is really nothing in early days to suggest a similar confusion of the widow and the deaconess⁶; and such a view finds its chief support in the *a priori* assumptions of a period in which the office of deaconess was unknown. For even Dr. Achelis, who holds

¹ 1 Tim. v. 9.

² *Ad Smyrn.* c. xiii. See Lightfoot's note.

³ *De Virg. vel.* c. 9.

⁴ See the passage from the Apostolic Church Order, below, p. 309, note 8, and cf. Lucian, *De Morte Peregr.* 12, St. Jerome, *Ep.* 52 (Migne, *P. L.* xxii. 532), and the description of the Viduate given by Tertullian, *De Virg. vel.* c. 9.

⁵ *Canones Hippolyti*, xxxii. 157: 'Virginum et viduarum est, ut sæpe ieiunent et orent in ecclesia' (*ubi supra*, p. 163).

⁶ Two apparent exceptions may be mentioned here. (a) *Cod. Theod.* xvi. ii. 27, 28, laws made at Milan in 390. In the former the age of admission of deaconesses is fixed at sixty years, and they are to be widows who have borne children, 'according to the precept of the Apostle'; and in the latter "deaconesses or widows" are permitted to give away their property during life but not to leave it by will, 'uti solent mulieres faciliores et liberaliores esse in ultimis voluntatibus, quam inter vivos.' But these are after all secular enactments; the latter may only be couched in vague terms so as to include both classes; and the former was never acted upon by the Church. The Council of Chalcedon (can. xv.) and the Council in *Trullo* (can. xiv.) record the fact that the age of ordination for the deaconess was forty; and to this the Civil law ultimately gave way (compare *Cod. Just.* i. iii. 9 and *Nov.* vi. 6 with *Nov.* cxxiii. 13, and on the whole subject see Ludlow, § 7, or Ziegler, pp. 355-356. (b) The twenty-first canon of the Council of Epâon forbids the 'viduarum consecrationem quas diaconas vocitant.' But a reference to the title of the canon, 'de viduis in diaconas non consecrandis,' makes it clear that there is here no such confusion (Bruns, ii. 170).

that at the end of the second century a female diaconate was everywhere included under the name of the Widows, is compelled to acknowledge that there was no such office at Rome in the third century, and to assume that the deaconess of the Syriac *Didascalia* holds a new office, quite distinct from that of the 'widow or deaconess' of the second century.

When this confusion is done away with, the early history of the office becomes clear. 1. In the West, as we have said, not only is there no evidence for the existence of the deaconess during the first four centuries, but all the evidence points clearly in the opposite direction. The absence of any reference to the office in the very full disciplinary manual known as the *Canons of Hippolytus* would of itself be enough to prove that it did not exist at the time, and in the place, of their compilation: that is (it seems certain) at the opening of the third century, and at Rome.¹ The same inference may be drawn not less conclusively from their absence throughout St. Cyprian's letters,² and in the famous list of the offices of the Church given by the Roman bishop Cornelius in his letter to Fabius of Antioch³ (A.D. 250). And again, the Western writers who refer to the deaconess, in commenting on Rom. xvi. 1 and 1 Tim. iii. 11, make it clear that the office was unknown in the West in their day, although known to exist in the East and amongst some heretical bodies. Such are pseudo-Jerome⁴ (Pelagius?) and Ambrosiaster⁵ (Hilary of Rome). From evidence such as this it seems perfectly clear that there were no deaconesses in the West down to the end of the fourth century.

2. The evidence with regard to Egypt is scantier, but so far as it goes it points clearly in the same direction. Clement and Origen⁶ both recognize that deaconesses (*διακόνων γυναικῶν*) were set in the ministry of the Church in St. Paul's day; but they do not suggest that the office had survived, still less that it existed in Egypt; and when they speak elsewhere of the ministry in their own day, the deaconess is not

¹ Such is the view of Achelis, Duchesne, Batiffol, and Robinson.

² Note especially St. Cyp. *Ep.* xxiii. xxix. xliii.

³ Eus. *H. E.* v. xliii. 11. 'One bishop . . . forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers, and over fifteen hundred widows and recipients of alms.' He is evidently describing the Roman Church of his own day.

⁴ *In Rom.* xvi. 1 (Migne, *P. L.* xxx. 714); *In 1 Tim.* iii. 11 (*ib.* 922).

⁵ *In 1 Tim.* iii. 11 (Migne, *P. L.* xvii. 469 sq.). In her index Miss Robinson describes this Hilary as *Bishop of Rome*.

⁶ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 6; Orig. *In Ep. ad Rom.* lib. x. § 17.

ment
Egypt
stages
Church
Clement
and w
Canon
bably
that i
from
to en
books
dialec
from
part
signs
rema
the la
N
later
the c
latter
passa
which
refer
a ver

1 (Lucan

2 (Reliqu

extra
2; se

lation
the T

4
are p

prepa
tioch

5
1891)

6
7

tution

8
and

one to

Text
Canon

mentioned.¹ But we possess further evidence with regard to Egypt in a disciplinary manual which is extant in two distinct stages of its growth. These are the so-called *Apostolic Church Order*² (in Greek, *The Constitutions by the hand of Clement and the Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles*), and what is commonly known as the Egyptian *Ecclesiastical Canons*.³ The former, extant in Greek and Syriac, is probably of the early third century; but Harnack has shown that it embodies two earlier fragments of Church law, dating from A.D. 140-180,⁴ and appearing from internal evidence to emanate from Egypt.⁵ The latter, consisting of seven books of canons, is extant in the Thebaic and Memphitic dialects, but is from a Greek original, which certainly emanated from the Church of Alexandria.⁶ It embodies the greater part of the former in its first book; its second shows clear signs of being based upon the *Canones Hippolyti*,⁷ whilst the remaining books are apparently but little later, perhaps of the latter part of the third century.

Now it is noteworthy that whilst both the earlier and the later form contain references to women's work, in the former the deaconess is unknown, whilst she appears fully in the latter. (a) The *Apostolic Church Order* has two distinct passages, one from each of the fragments of Church law upon which, according to Harnack, it is based. In the former⁸ the reference is simply to the widows; whilst the second passage, a very extraordinary one, represents a consultation as taking

¹ Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* iii. 6; Orig. *Hom. vi. in Isaiam, Hom. xvii. in Lucam.*

² Printed by Bickell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* (1843); Lagarde, *Reliquiæ Juris Ecclesiastici* (1858); Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum* (1863); and Harnack, *Texte u. Unters.* II. i. 2; see Prof. Robinson's Appendix, p. 191.

³ Printed by Dr. Tattam in a late Memphitic version, with a translation, in *Apostolic Constitutions in Coptic* (1848), and more correctly, in the Thebaic, by Lagarde in his *Ægyptiaca*.

⁴ *Texte u. Unters.* ii. 5. p. 55. It may turn out that these fragments are part of the so-called *Testamentum Jesu Christi*, which is just being prepared for publication by Mgr. Rahmani, the Uniat Patriarch of Antioch for the Syrians (*Tablet*, Dec. 3, 1898, p. 893).

⁵ See Harnack's notes, *passim*. Dr. Salmon (*Introduction*, p. 552, ed. 1891) calls it 'the foundation of Egyptian Ecclesiastical Law.'

⁶ Mason, *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 251.

⁷ As the eighth book of the [late fourth century] *Apostolical Constitutions* in turn depends upon it. See Achelis in *Texte u. Unters.* vi. 4.

⁸ 'Three widows shall be appointed, two to persevere in prayer . . . and for revelations concerning anything that may be wanting, but one to assist the women visited with sickness'; Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.* p. 103, *Texte u. Unters.* ii. 5, p. 22 sq. The parallel passage in the *Ecclesiastical Canons* is given in Tattam, p. 23 sq.; Lagarde, *Ægyptiaca*, p. 246.

place amongst the Apostles, the result of which is a distinct rejection of any ministration of women, excepting a purely eleemosynary one to their sisters in need.¹ This can only denote a distinct rejection of the claim of women to a share in the ministry of the Church; but even so, as Professor Robinson points out, 'it shows that a female diaconate was known in some Churches, though it was rejected by the author of this book.' (b) But when we turn to the later Egyptian *Ecclesiastical Canons*, the case is different. The first book, as we have said, is based upon the *Apostolic Church Order*; and the two passages that we have just noticed are reproduced in substance.² The second book, corresponding to the *Canones Hippolyti*, has no reference to the deaconess, although there are many to the widows and virgins.³ The third book contains no reference to the ministry of women;⁴ but after this the references are fairly frequent, though care is taken to make it clear that the deaconess does not rank with the higher clergy.⁵

It may be said that such disciplinary manuals are of little value. But they presuppose a Church life to which they apply; and taking them in connexion with the evidence from Origen and Clement, we conclude unhesitatingly that there was a time when the office of deaconess was non-existent in Lower Egypt; and that it was introduced in the latter part

¹ Andrew is represented as beginning: 'It is [or Is it] profitable to appoint a ministry (*διακονίαν*) for the women'; John points out that the Lord 'suffered not the women to stand with us' (*συστῆναι ἡμῖν*, i.e. to stand at the Altar: Harnack, *T. u. U. ii.* 5, p. 28); and James ends the discussion: 'How then, concerning women, can we appoint ministrations (*διακονίας*) save a ministration (*διακονίαν*) that they should render to women who are in need?' For the whole of this passage see Lagarde, *Reliquiae*, p. 79, Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.* p. 104, and Professor Robinson's Appendix, pp. 192-3.

² See cc. 21, 24-28: Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, pp. 247, 248; Tattam, p. 27. It is, however, worth noticing that in the (modern) Memphitic version given by Tattam an ambiguity has been introduced: instead of 'except a ministration' &c., it reads 'as well as a ministration,' and the passage may be taken to mean that there *is* a diaconate of women.

³ Canons 37, 38, 47, 52.

⁴ Excepting, indeed, a reminder that some women had the gift of prophecy in the Old Testament, and 'if there be a man or woman who has received these great gifts, let him humble himself,' &c., c. 63.

⁵ For example, c. 66 (c. 67 Tattam), a deaconess is not to be ordained: c. 72 (73) she is not to bless, or to do any of the things that the presbyters or deacons do, but to keep the doors, and she may be put out [suspended?] by the deacon but not by the subdeacon: c. 74 (75), the remains of the offerings at the Eucharist are to be divided, one [tenth] part being given 'to the subdeacons and readers and singers and deaconesses.'

of the third century, care being taken to avoid any confusion with the higher orders of the ministry.

3. We now turn to the fuller evidence of the East. There is no reason to doubt that the two maidservants called *ministrae*, whom Pliny¹ tortured in order to extract information as to the life of the Christian society in Bithynia, held this office. It is not a little remarkable that neither Ignatius nor Polycarp mentions the office;² but there is no such evidence *against* its existence as we have found elsewhere. And when we hear of the deaconess again, it is not in such a way as to imply that she had ever ceased to exist. She stands in the same general relation to the widow, and to the Church at large, as she had done at the first. This being so, we are justified in thinking that the office which existed early in the second century is that which we find in full operation in the middle of the third century. For there can be no question that it is so found in the East from that time forward, both in disciplinary manuals and in the records of actual life. As regards the former, we have the *Apostolic Didascalia* of the middle of the third century,³ and the *Apostolic Constitutions* of the end of the fourth. The *Constitutions* consist of eight books, six of which contain the *Didascalia* with alterations, whilst the seventh is based upon the *Didaché*, and the eighth, as we have said, upon the second book of the Egyptian *Ecclesiastical Canons*.

The evidence which is given by these two manuals (the *Didascalia* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*) has been so clearly set forth by Professor Robinson in his Appendix to Miss Robinson's book, that we need do no more than summarize it here. In the *Didascalia* there is the following extraordinary passage, evidently based upon St. Ignatius:⁴

'The Bishop shall sit for you in the place of Almighty God. And the Deacon shall stand in the place of Christ: and ye shall love him. And the Deaconess shall be honoured by you in the place of

¹ *Ep.* xcvi.

² If the *ministrae* of Pliny's letters are deaconesses, the silence of Ignatius cannot mean that they did not exist. And it is possible, at least, that he includes them with the men-deacons under the title *διακόνος*, like St. Chrysostom, who can hardly be accused of being unaware of the existence of women-deacons. (*Hom. xxx. in 1 Cor.*: 'For as bishops and presbyters and deacons and virgins and continent persons enter into my enumeration . . . so also do the widows.')'

³ Extant in Syriac and Latin versions. The former was published anonymously, by Lagarde, in 1854; an edition of the latter is being prepared by Hauler.

⁴ St. Ign. *Magn.* 6, *Smyrn.* 8, *Trall.* 3.

the Holy Spirit.¹ And the Presbyter shall be to you as a type of the Apostles. And the Orphans and Widows shall be counted unto you as a type of the Altar.'

Elsewhere the work of the deaconess is set forth: she is to minister to the sick and to visit in their homes those women whom the deacon cannot 'because of the heathen'; she is to instruct catechumens and neophytes, and above all, 'when women go down into the water, it is required that by a deaconess those who go down into the water should be anointed with the oil of anointing,' though it is provided that the deaconess should neither perform the actual baptism nor administer the subsequent anointing of the head.

When we turn to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, we find these passages reproduced with some alterations and certain others added. The work of the deaconess remains much the same:² instruction, visiting, administering to the women, especially in the administration of Baptism. This last, which may be called her characteristic function, is of special interest, since in it, as Odelem has observed, she was succeeding to a function such as had been performed by women in the baptizing of a proselyte to Judaism.³ But although her

¹ In the *Apostolic Constitutions* there is added to this passage: 'as neither doth the Paraclete do or speak ought of Himself, but glorifying Christ waiteth upon His Will.' On which Petavius remarks 'Quæ sunt γραῶδῃ et hæresim præterea τῶν πνευματομάχων redolent.' Oehler, *Corpus Hæc.* iii. p. cccviii.

² With the addition of the keeping of the gates of the women: *Apost. Const.* viii. 27. It is worth noticing that the same function is implied in a passage of one of the false Ignatius letters, written at the same time, if not by the same hand, as the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Lightfoot, *Ignat.* iii. 240-2): 'Ἀσπάζομαι τὰς φρουροὺς τῶν ἁγίων πυλῶνων, τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ διακόνους. Ps.-Ign. *Ad Antioch.* 12. At a later date the Eastern deaconess also had charge of the vestments (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* tom. III. pars ii. p. 848). And a canon of Jacob of Edessa in the Jacobite Pontifical allows the deaconess to cleanse the sanctuary and light the lamps in the absence of the higher clergy, to take the Eucharist from the receptacle in the Sanctuary and deliver it to women and infants, and even to administer the Chalice [in the congregation?] in case of need. With the permission of the Bishop she might mix the Chalice, but might not place a fragment of the Bread in the Chalice as the deacon did (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III. ii. 849, and especially *Dissertatio de Monophysitis*, § 10. This latter is printed at the beginning of the second volume of the *Bibl. Orient.* and is unpagéd). The Apocryphal *Testament of the Lord*, of a much earlier date, directs that the deaconess shall carry the Eucharist to a woman who is sick and cannot come to church (Robinson, p. 194).

³ Odelem, § ix. (it is not paged), from Rambam, cap. xiv. (Rambam is of course Maimonides, and the passage is in the *Mishneh Torah* Hilkhoth Issure Bia, cap. xiv. §§ 6, 7.) He gives the following translation of the passage: 'Postea baptizant eum, et tres consistunt superiori loco, et

functions are the same, a change has come over her whole position. In Professor Robinson's words, 'we feel instinctively that the deaconess has dropped. She is, indeed, first among the women of the Church, but Readers and Singers and Door-keepers have got in front of her. . . . The Deacon is the servant of the Bishop; the Deaconess is the servant of the Deacon.'¹

In fact, the deaconess has come to occupy a position somewhat similar to that which we have seen her occupying in the Egyptian *Ecclesiastical Canons*, with, however, one important exception: she has received an ordination properly so called;² she is still a part of the clergy, though an inferior part; in the language of a later day, she is *in minor orders*. But it may be doubted how far this decline in her status prevailed in the East; for the later forms for the ordination of deaconesses are in many ways parallel to those for deacons,³ and the laws of Justinian make it clear that at Constantinople she was regarded as being on a level with them.⁴ In the great church of St. Sophia, we are told, there were not to be more than one hundred male and forty female deacons.⁵

notificant ipsi quædam gravia, quædam item levia præcepta, vice secunda, et ipse consistet in aqua; quod si femina fuit, mulieres aliæ eam in aqua colloquant usque ad collum suum, iudicibus foris consistentibus, qui ipsi nota faciunt quædam gravia levique præcepta, atque ipsa sedet in aqua. Postea immergit se coram ipsis; ipsi vero iudices avertunt faciem suam et egrediuntur, ne feminam videant ascendentem ex aqua.' See also the story told by John Moschus of Conon, the monk of Pentoucla (Robinson, p. 87).

¹ *The Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. 175.

² See the form in Robinson, p. 188. Van Espen (*Jus Eccl. Univ.*), Hefele, and Maskell (*Monumenta*, vol. II. p. cvii, ed. 1882) amongst others have tried to show that the laying on of hands in their case was of the nature of a benediction, and not of an ordination. But there can be no question that they were really ordained. The words *χειροτομία*, and *ordinatio* are used of them in precisely the same way as of deacons &c., whilst they are not so used of the widows and virgins: e.g. in the fourteenth canon of the Council in *Trullo* the deaconesses are to be ordained (*χειροτονεῖσθαι*) and the widows to be enrolled (*καταλέγεσθαι*). See Thomassin (*in loc.*), Morinus, *De Sacr. Ord.* Pars. III. exerc. X. cap. i. p. 143 (ed. Antuerpiæ, 1695), Pankowski, cap. iv. § 28, and Robinson, pp. 70-72, 187-90.

³ They are collected by Miss Robinson in her Appendix B. The Latin rite given on p. 203 after Muratori had been previously published in the *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* tom. viii. p. 471 (Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1618). Scipio Maffei found a form 'ad diaconam faciendam' in a manuscript in the Library of Verona, but did not publish it: *Osservazioni sulle Complessioni di Cassiodoro* (*Opere*, tom. x. p. 223, ed. Venezia, 1790).

⁴ See Ludlow, § 7, p. 51 sq.

⁵ *Nov.* iii. 1 (Migne, *P. L.* lxxii. 924): 'Sancimus ne quando in

And although the number was probably less at an earlier period, it is clear that they were at work everywhere in the East. The Council of Nicæa recognizes the office as a matter of course;¹ and we have seen that later Eastern Councils do so too. Epiphanius bears witness to it, and distinguishes it from other offices which are unknown to the Church.² Some five deaconesses at Constantinople are familiar to us in connexion with St. Chrysostom;³ St. Gregory of Nyssa tells us of another;⁴ and St. Basil writes to three sisters who held the office at Samosata.⁵ Miss Robinson has given the names of some twenty others,⁶ and to these may be added three more: (a) Dionysia, the mother of St. Euthymius the Great, who was ordained deaconess by Otreius, Bishop of Melitina in Upper Armenia, at the same time that her son was made a reader;⁷ (b) Manaris, a deaconess at Gaza in the early fifth century;⁸ and (c) Irene, a deaconess at Constanti-

sacrosancta majore ecclesia ultra lx presbyteros, diaconos vero mares centum, feminas xl, et subdiaconos xc, lectores autem ultra cx, cantores ultra xxv existent, ut universus reverendissimorum clericorum majorum numerus in ccccxxv personis, et centum præterea ostiariis (ut vocant) consistat.¹ Miss Robinson gives some facts in the later history of the deaconesses at Constantinople (*Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. 91).

¹ Canon xix. See Dr. Bright's note.

² Epiph. *Hæc* 79, 4; *Expositio Fidei*, 21; and a letter amongst those of St. Jerome (No. li.).

³ Olympias (ordained by Nectarius, *Soz. H. E.* viii. 9), Sabiniana (who followed St. Chrysostom to Cucusus, *Ep.* xliii.), Pentadia (*Ep.* xciv.), Amprucla (*Ep.* ciii.), and, unless she is the same person, Procla, mentioned in the *Life* by Palladius.

⁴ Lampadia, mentioned in his *Life of Macrina*.

⁵ *Ep.* cv. A passage in another letter which has often been referred to in this connexion, e.g. by Ziegler (p. 359) and Dr. Bright (see Howson, *Diaconate of Women*, p. 66), has really nothing whatever to do with deaconesses. It is in the *Epistola Canonica II.* (*Ep.* cxcix.), No. 24: 'A widow whose name is in the list of widows, that is, *who is being ministered to by the Church* (τὴν διακονουμένην ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας), is directed by the Apostle to be supported no longer if she marries.' The words in italics have been taken to mean *who is received into the order of deaconesses*; but it is quite clear that they mean nothing of the kind.

⁶ The real name of the Constantinopolitan deaconess whom Miss Robinson calls Regina, after Baronius (*Ann. Eccl.* 515 A.D.), is Basilina, and it is so given in the *Life of St. John the Silentary* (*Acta SS.* May 13, vol. iii. p. 237 sq.).

⁷ See the *Life of St. Euthymius the Great* (*A. SS. Boll.* vol. ii. January 20, p. 302 sq.): 'in gradus lectorum eum cooptat, atque matrem quidem Dionysiam . . . diaconissam ordinat suæ ecclesiæ.' This must have been in the latter part of the fourth century, as Otreius was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381.

⁸ See the *Life of St. Porphyry Bishop of Gaza* (*A. SS. Boll.* vol. iii. February 16, p. 660).

nople who was ordained by St. Methodius in the earlier half of the ninth century.¹

But many, perhaps most, of the later Eastern deaconesses had come to occupy a position differing not a little from that of early days, and one which had not a little to do with their final disappearance. They had gradually become 'ruling women,' thus, it may be, displacing the *presbytides*.² The process was a very natural one, and had begun very early. The deaconess, for instance, might become head of the society of virgins,³ or, indeed, abbess of a convent,⁴ without thereby being withdrawn from that which was her primary work in

¹ See the *Life of St. Irene* (*A. S. S. Boll.* vol. vi. July 28, p. 601).

² The following passages may be noticed with regard to the *πρεσβύτερες* or 'elder widows': (1) Titus ii. 3, they are to be *ἐν καταστήματι ἱερωνειῶν* (or, as Archbishop Benson used to translate it, 'having the majesty of priestesses'), which distinctly suggests a position of authority. (2) In the Apocryphal *Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew* the king Fulvanus is appointed presbyter, his son deacon, his wife *presbytis*, and his son's wife deaconess; so that the *presbytis* has evidently 'a more dignified position than that of deaconess' (Robinson, p. 195 sq.; the Acts are printed by Tischendorf, *Apocryphal Acts of Apostles*, p. 166 sq.). (3) A later recension of this document makes the king's wife a deaconess only (*ib.*). (4) The Council of Laodiceæ (canon xi.) forbids the appointment of *πρεσβύτερες* or *προκαθήμεναι* in the Church (or, as Dionysius Exiguus renders it, 'eas quæ dicuntur viduæ seniores vel presidentes'); and Epiphanius, whilst bearing witness to the continued use of the name to denote the older widows in the Church, is careful to distinguish them from *πρεσβυτερίδας* or *ἐπίσκοπας* (*Hæc.* 79, 3; cf. Ps.-Ath. *De Virginitate*, § 11, where the name is given by way of honour to the elder virgins). We may infer that this careful distinction had become necessary in view of the fact that outside the Church sacerdotal functions were not withheld from women. (5) But neither the title nor the functions connected with it died out at once. Pope Gregory the Great (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. 2, ep. vii. ed. Bened.) mentions the abbess of a convent in Sardinia who refused 'usque ad diem obitus indui se monachica veste' and continued 'in vestibus quibus loci illius utantur presbyteræ,' and who said 'hoc pene ex consuetudine licuisse;' and Atto of Vercelli is aware that such an office had formerly existed, although he knows little or nothing about it: *Epist. ad Ambr.* (Migne, *P. L.* cxxxiv., quoted by Miss Robinson, p. 94). (6) An *Ordo Romanus* given by Mabillon (*Museum Italicum*, ii. 91, *Ordo Romanus ix*; Migne, *P. L.* lxxviii. 1005), which he dates from about the time of Pope Leo III. (*Mus. It.* ii. 39 n.), mentions 'feminæ diaconissæ et presbyterissæ quæ eodem die benedicuntur' as amongst those who took part in the procession at the coronation of an emperor. Pinus discreetly prints the passage 'diaconissæ . . . quæ eodem die' &c., thus avoiding the consideration of a difficult question. There is a German work, *De Presbyterissis veteris Ecclesiæ Commentariolus*, by Matt. Zimmerman (Annæbergæ, 1681); but it is not particularly luminous.

³ As were Olympias, Publia, and Lampadia. We are told also that, owing to her retiring disposition, Nicarete refused to be a deaconess, or to preside over the virgins: *Soz. H. E.* viii. 14.

⁴ As were the deaconesses Jannia, Valeriana, Irene, and, apparently, Anastasia.

and for the Church; and from the fourth century onwards we find her occupying both these positions, and especially the latter. But the connexion came to be far closer than this. We cannot indeed be sure that the time ever came in the East when all abbesses were deaconesses,¹ or conversely when all deaconesses were abbesses;² but certainly, as time went on, the state of things was not far from this, and the word *deaconess* came to be used as a synonym for abbess.¹ It is so used in a canon³ of Rabulas (or Rabbulas), Bishop of Edessa from 412 to 435 (or 436);⁴ in the Life of St. Eupraxia (or Euphrasia),⁵ which, in spite of some legendary setting, is in the main historical; and in the citation of this Life by St. John of Damascus.⁶ And other instances might easily be given from later Greek writers.⁷

And thus the gradual decay of the office in the East was assured. Deaconesses were no longer needed for the exercise of the most distinctive function of their office—the anointing in Holy Baptism—partly because the anointing of the whole body had been dropped in most parts of the East, partly because adult baptisms had become so rare as not to require any regular provision.⁸ Accordingly the ordination of deaconesses gradually ceased, not owing to any express enactment, but simply because there was no longer any

¹ After *deaconess* had become a common name for an abbess, the Syriac *amma* continues to be used in some cases, the inference being that those who are so described are not deaconesses.

² As Miss Robinson says, the beautiful inscription to the deaconess Aeria, 'deaconess of the Saints, the friend of all,' would seem to indicate that she was an active 'servant of the Church' (*op. cit.* p. 92).

³ 'Monachi sine presbytero, et moniales sine diaconissa, ne pergant ad synaxes' (Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 959; Migne, *P. G.* lxxvii. 1473 sq.). Assemani gives the canon with the addition (probably a gloss), 'ut enim presbyter monachis, ita et diaconissa monialibus præest in divinis officiis' (*Dissertatio de Monophysitis*, § 10; *Bibl. Orient.* vol. ii.).

⁴ He died in 435 (*Dict. Chr. Biog.*) or 436 (Le Quien).

⁵ *Vita Sanctæ Euphrasie* [*Eupraxiæ*] *auctore incerto*, given in Greek in *Acta S.S.* Boll. Mar. 13, vol. ii. p. 727 sq., in Latin, p. 265 sq., and Migne, *P. G.* lxxiii. 623 sq. Throughout the Life *ἡ διάκονος* is used for the abbess of the convent of Thebes, to which Euphrasia retired.

⁶ St. Joh. Damasc. *Orat. iii. pro Sacris Imaginibus*: Migne, *P. G.* xciv. 1417.

⁷ The present writer has found abbesses described as *archidiaconissæ* in the East, but cannot lay hands on the reference.

⁸ The most interesting statement of the subject is that of Michael the Jacobite Patriarch, *circa* 1190 (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 154), who inserted in the Jacobite Pontifical a canon to the effect that deaconesses were no longer ordained, because people were baptized in infancy, but that they might still be ordained in case of urgent necessity (*Dissert. De Monoph.* § 10).

distinctive meaning in the office.¹ Balsamon, Patriarch of Antioch in the eleventh century, knows of the continued existence of deaconesses at Constantinople, but says that none were ordained in his own Church, 'although certain nuns (*ἀσκητρίαι*) are called deaconesses by a misuse of terms.'² Matthew Blastares, writing in the fourteenth century, does not even know what the office of deaconess was, but has a vague idea that it had something to do with the baptism of women.³ And although the name still survived in Eastern Service-books, as anything else does which has never been expressly removed, it would appear that the office has practically ceased in the East from the thirteenth century.

We now turn to the West, where, as has been said, there are no signs that the office had ever existed down to the end of the fourth century. After this period we find our first mention of deaconesses in the canons of Councils forbidding their ordination; and the circumstances are such as to indicate that the office was of recent introduction from the East.

The starting-point is a Synod at Nîmes, the Acts of which are genuine but little known, not being published in any collection.⁴ It was held in 394, five years after the edict of Theodosius had banished the Manichees from the East. The result was a great influx of Manichees (and others) into Gaul, and it is with them⁵ that the Synod is dealing. The first canon says that many of these 'de ultimis Orientis partibus venientes' have presbyters and clergy who are not ordained,

¹ This gradual loss of *distinctiveness* may be illustrated (a) by the comment of Primasius on Romans xvi. 1: 'Quomodo diacones sunt, sive in ministerio verbi: nam et feminae tunc in suo sexu docebant, sicut legimus de Priscilla' (Migne, *P. L.* lxxviii. 505; Primasius was bishop of Adermetus or Justinianopolis, *circa* 550); (b) by the forty-eighth canon of the Council in *Trullo*, which directed that the wife of a priest elevated to the episcopate might, if worthy, be made a deaconess (Bruns, i. 52).

² *In Can. xv. Chalced.* The custom mentioned by Bar-Hebraeus (*sæc.* xiii.) that in the neighbourhood of Antioch the abbess was a deaconess, and administered the Eucharist to her nuns in the absence of a priest, must probably be such a titular use of the word as Balsamon speaks of. And the statement of H. A. Daniell (*Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae*, iv. 698) that amongst the Maronites the abbess receives the benediction and the privileges of a deaconess may refer to a like usage.

³ Quoted by Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 93.

⁴ They were first printed by Iñigo Rodríguez at Cologne in 1743, then, from a manuscript of the sixth century, by Dr. Kunst in 1839, and again by Hefele (*History of Councils*, Eng. tr. ii. 402 sq.).

⁵ That is, with Eastern immigrants as a whole, rather than with any particular body of Manichees.

and who of course must not be received as such.¹ The second goes on to say that it appears that they have also women who hold the levitical office, and the bishops in Synod exhaust the capacities of language in declaring their detestation of such a novel outrage, repudiate the ordinations, and say that nothing of the kind is to be done in future.²

Whatever we may think of this Gallican view of the ministry of women, at least it is clear that these Gallican bishops knew nothing whatever of such a ministry. But they cannot long have remained in ignorance. It was the period of that great intercourse between the East and Gaul which, thanks to the Abbé Duchesne and others, we are every day getting to realize more clearly. The bishops must presently have learned that the office was well enough known in the East; and before long the practice of ordaining deaconesses had crept into Gaul.

We know this from the frequent canons of Councils during the next century forbidding such ordinations, but implying that they had taken place.³ The first Council of Orange, in 441, declared that deaconesses were on no account to be ordained, and that 'if there were any already' they were to rank with the laity;⁴ whilst by another canon it laid greater stress upon the setting apart of widows.⁵ The Council of Epâon (517) again forbade the consecration of widows into deaconesses;⁶ and the second Council of Orleans (533), whilst recognizing the deaconesses already existing, determines that none are henceforward to be set apart, 'by reason of the frailty of their sex.'⁷ This, however, is the last of such

¹ Hefele, *ubi supra*.

² *Ib.* 'Illud etiam a quibusdam suggestum est, ut contra apostolicam disciplinam, incognito usque in hoc tempus in ministerium nescio quo loco leviticum videantur adsumptæ: quod quidem, quia indecens est, non admittit ecclesiastica disciplina; et contra rationem facta talis ordinatio destruat[ur] [*lege destruat[ur]*]: providendum, ne quis sibi hoc ultra præsumat.'

³ It is only necessary to glance at the view which has been widely held (*e.g.* by Ziegler, *op. cit.* c. xix., and Dr. Bright, *Notes on the Canons*, Nicæa xix.) that these Gallican canons forbade the *ordaining* of deaconesses whilst allowing an already existing non-ordained diaconate of women to continue. Such a view is inconsistent both with the earlier history of the office in the West and with the subsequent facts in Gaul itself, and is rightly rejected by Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 58 sq.

⁴ Canon XXVI.: 'Diaconissæ omnimodis non ordinandæ: si quæ jam sunt, benedictioni quæ populo impenditur capita submittant.'

⁵ Canon XXVII.: they are to make a profession and wear a special dress.

⁶ Canon XXI.

⁷ Canons XVII. XVIII.: it would appear that many of them had married.

enactments. It is possible that in the twelfth of the *Statuta Antiqua Ecclesiae*, a code compiled in the South of Gaul, and probably in the early part of the sixth century, we have an actual recognition of the office, although the name is not mentioned.¹ But at any rate, eleven years after the Second Council of Orleans, its decree was expressly disregarded;² and after this deaconesses are several times referred to, although their number in Gaul can never have been very large. So far as we are aware the names of only two individual Gallican deaconesses have survived, both of whom are mentioned by Miss Robinson. They are Hilaria, the daughter of St. Remigius,³ bishop of Reims; and St. Rhadegund,⁴ the wife of King Clothaire I. We have, indeed, other evidence, in Gaul or in Germany, of the existence of the office,⁵ and also not a little which shows that other women

¹ 'Viduae vel sanctimoniales quae ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, instructae sint ad officium, ut possint aperto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres tempore quo baptizandae sunt, qualiter baptizatori ad interrogata respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptizmate vivant.' This may imply that certain virgins and widows were set apart in a new office, that of the deaconess, to which there is a veiled reference in the naming of this characteristic function; and, on the other hand, it may mean that certain of the virgins and widows were allowed to exercise this function, which naturally belonged to the deaconess.

² In the case of St. Rhadegund.

³ He died in 530, and by his will leaves a female slave to his 'blessed daughter, the deaconess Hilaria' (Migne, *P. L.* lxx. 973).

⁴ The case is rather curious: see Robinson, p. 61 *sq.* According to the *Life of St. Rhadegund* by her friend Venantius Fortunatus (*Acta S.S.* Boll. Aug. 13), she fled from the court in 544, and besought Bishop Medard of Noyon to consecrate her to the Lord. He at first demurred, but at length *manu superposita consecravit eam diaconam*. She appears never to have exercised her office, and ultimately became a nun in the monastery at Poitiers, which she had herself founded.

⁵ See the third collection of canons appended to the Frankish *Capitularium: Capit. Add.* iii. 78 (Baluz. i. 1171): 'Si diaconissa nupserit, gladio ultoris sternatur, et facultas eius ecclesiae ubi servivit addicatur,' &c. This is based on *Nov.* vi. 6; but it obviously applies to an existing state of things. The first four books of the *Capitularium* were compiled by the abbat Ansegis about 827 A.D., and the last three by the deacon Benedict about 846; the *Additio Tertia* is probably a little later.

The later Latin commentators are much given to copying the statements of earlier writers irrespectively of the facts of their own day. But it may be mentioned that in commenting upon Rom. xvi. 1, Sedulius Scotus, probably a monk of St. Gall about 820, speaks of deaconesses as existing in the East (Migne, *P. L.* ciii. 123); Rabanus Maurus (*ib.* cxi. 1605) notes the fact that the office has apostolical authority; Haymo of Halberstadt (*ib.* cxvii. 503) says not a word of the office of deaconess, and merely regards Phœbe as having helped the Apostle; whilst St. Bruno the Carthusian (*ib.* cliii. 120), Herveus of Bordeaux (*ib.* clxxxi. 806), and Peter Lombard (*ib.* cxci. 1527) are equally barren.

had intruded into sacred things to a remarkable degree.¹ It points to the existence of something altogether anomalous in the position of women in the extreme West, which perhaps may have been a survival from paganism.

We turn now to Italy, whither in all probability the deaconess came from Gaul. For here, as elsewhere, the evidence points to the Eastern influence having reached Northern Italy by way of Gaul, and not directly. The earliest sign of her existence is the interesting epitaph at Pavia of 'Theodora, the deaconess of blessed memory,' who died in 539.² There is indeed one deaconess of somewhat earlier date (c. 450), whose place of abode has been held to be doubtful. This is the learned Syncletica, whose brother Eustathius dedicated to her his Latin version of the *Hexameron* of St. Basil.³ She is also mentioned in the first of two dedicatory letters prefixed by the poet Sedulius to his *Carmen Paschale*, and addressed to the abbat Macedonius.⁴ From this we learn that Sedulius was living in close religious fellowship, probably in a monastery, with Macedonius and others, including Syncletica, *sacra virgo et ministra*, at the time that he wrote his poem. And this fact assures us beyond reasonable doubt that she abode in Achaia,⁵ and not further westward.

There is other evidence which indicates that there cannot have been deaconesses in Italy until about the time of Theodora; viz. a statement of Cassiodorus, which has not been noticed hitherto. The work in which it occurs, his

¹ See (a) Second Council of Braga, 573 A.D., c. xlii.: 'Non liceat mulieres in secretarium [*al. sacrarium*] ingredi.' (b) *Capit. Aquisgr.* 789 A.D., c. lxxiv. (Baluz. i. 238): 'Auditum est aliquas abbatissas contra morem sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ, benedictiones cum manus impositione et signaculo sanctæ crucis super capite virorum dare, necnon et velare virgines cum benedictione sacerdotali.' This is of course forbidden. (c) Council of Paris, 829 A.D., c. xlv., forbids women to approach the altar or handle the sacred vessels. (d) Pseudo-Soter, *Ep.* ii.: consecrated women (*sacratas Deo feminas*) and nuns are forbidden to touch the holy vessels (Hinschius, *Decr. Ps.-Isid.* p. 124). (e) Other cases are given by Hans Achelis in the article above referred to.

² Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* v. 571 sq.: given by Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 88.

³ 'Eustathius Syncleticæ germanæ diaconissæ salutem in Christo' &c. It was used by Cassiodorus (*Div. Lect.* c. i.: *Opera*, p. 445, Geneva, 1650, and Migne, *P. L.* lxx. 1110).

⁴ *Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.* x. 9, and Migne, *P. L.* xix. col. 542; cf. col. 443.

⁵ According to the subscription of early MSS. of Sedulius, which is probably based upon a lost passage of Gennadius, Sedulius had lived as a layman in Italy, and afterwards became a monk and wrote his poems in Achaia. See Teuffel-Schwabe, *History of Roman Literature*, ed. Warr, ii. 498 sq. § 473; *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iv. 598.

Commentary on Romans, is not now extant; but his comment on Rom. xvi. 1 is quoted by Abailard, and is as follows:

‘Significat diaconissam fuisse matris ecclesiæ, quod in partibus Græcorum hodie usque peragitur, quibus et baptizandi usus in ecclesia non negatur.’¹

This proves that Cassiodorus, writing in his *Monasterium Vivariense* near Squillace, at some time after 538,² knew nothing of the existence of deaconesses in the West. And although he may well have been ignorant of what was going on in Gaul, the acute and devout minister of Theodoric could not have remained in ignorance of such an institution in Italy, had it been of any considerable standing.

After Theodora there is a long gap in our evidence. The fact that no deaconess is mentioned throughout the letters of Gregory the Great shows that they can hardly have been common in his day, but would not justify the conclusion that there were none. On the other hand, the fact that Claudius of Turin (bishop 821–839) recognizes the Apostolic origin of the office³ does not prove that it existed in Italy in his day. The language of Atto, however, who was Bishop of Vercelli in the tenth century, is harder to understand. He recognizes that there was once a ministry of women in the Church, but distinctly implies that it is a thing of the past:⁴ and it is impossible not to hold, with Miss Robinson, that ‘Bishop Atto had never seen a Deaconess.’

But although deaconesses were unknown in the neighbourhood of Vercelli in the tenth century, they were certainly not

¹ *Sermo xxx. in Natali Sancti Stephani* (*Opera*, i. 555, ed. Cousin, Paris, 1849). Cassiodorus's commentary on the Romans was not part of his *Complexiones in Epist. Apostolorum*, which were discovered at Verona, and published by Scipio Maffei in 1721 (reprinted in Migne, *P. L.* lxx. 1316 *sq.*). But we know of its existence from his own statement (*De Orthographia*, præf. 3: *Opera*, p. 492, ed. Geneva, 1650; Migne, *P. L.* lxx. 1240); and it was familiar reading to Hincmar of Reims (*De Prædestinatione Dissertatio Posterior*, c. 25 ult.; Migne, *P. L.* cxxv. 268); so that there can be no reason for doubting the accuracy of Abailard's citation.

² Hodgkin, *Letters of Cassiodorus*, p. 51.

³ His comment on Rom. xvi. 1 is quoted by Abailard as follows: ‘Hic locus apostolica auctoritate docet etiam feminas in ministerio Ecclesiæ institui.’ Only fragments of the commentary of Claudius on St. Paul's Epistles have been published (Migne, *P. L.* ciii. 925 *sq.*), and this comment is not amongst them. But the whole commentary exists in manuscript, and according to M. Cousin it contains this passage. See *Abailardi Opera*, i. 135 note 1 (ed. Cousin), and Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat. Med. Æv.*, s.v. Claudius Hispanus (i. 358, ed. Florentiæ, 1858).

⁴ *In Rom. xvi. 1*: ‘Ostendit quia tunc non solum viri sed etiam feminae præerant ecclesiis’ (Migne, *P. L.* cxxiv. 281). See also his letter to Ambrosius, quoted by Miss Robinson, p. 94.

unknown elsewhere in Italy, then or afterwards. One such deaconess, Anna, the sister of Dometius, deacon and treasurer¹ of the Holy See, is known to us by a votive tablet which formerly stood in the porch of S. Paolo fuori le Mura at Rome. It is probably of the eighth century, and the inscription runs as follows:²

✠ DE DONIS DĪ ET BEATI APOSTOLI.
DOMETIVS DIAC. ET ARCARIVS SCĀE
SED. APOSTOL. ADQVE PP. VNA CVM
ANNA DIAC. EIVS GERMANA HOC
VOTVM BEATO PAVLO OPTVLERV̄T.

After this we come across not a few traces of deaconesses at Rome. They are mentioned twice over, quite incidentally, at the end of the eighth century: once in a Roman *Ordo*³ of the time of Leo III., and again in the account of the triumphal return of that Pontiff to the city in 799.⁴ Then comes another gap in the evidence; but after this, in the early part of the eleventh century, quite a number of papal charters are extant which speak of the office. There is one from Benedict VIII. (1012-1024) to Benedict, bishop of Portus;⁵ another dated A.D. 1029, from John XIX. to the same bishop;⁶ a third, dated by Mabillon A.D. 1026 or 1027, from John XIX. to the Bishop of Silva-Candida;⁷ and a fourth, dated 1039 by Migne, from Benedict IX. to the same bishop or his successor.⁸ A

¹ For the office of Arcarius Romanæ Ecclesiæ (*or* sanctæ sedis) see Du Cange, *s.v.*, and the passages there referred to.

² R. Fabretti, *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Explicatio*, p. 758, No. 639 (Romæ, 1699).

³ *Ordo Romanus ix.*: Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, ii. 91; or Migne, *P. L.* lxxviii. col. 1005.

⁴ In his Life by Anastasius the Librarian; Migne, *P. L.* cxxviii. 1215 sq.

⁵ Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, i. 116 sq., or Migne, *P. L.* cxxxix. 1617: 'Concedimus et confirmamus vobis vestrisque successoribus in perpetuum omnem ordinationem episcopalem, tam de presbyteris quam diaconibus vel diaconissis, seu subdiaconibus . . . quæ in tota Transtiberi necessaria fuerit, faciendam, nisi cardinalis presbyter vel cardinalis diaconus . . . efficiatur.'

⁶ Gaetano Marini, *Papiri diplomatici*, i. 70 (Roma, 1805), or Migne, *P. L.* cxli. 1115 sq.: ' . . . omnem ordinationem episcopalem, tam de presbyteris quam diaconibus vel diaconissis seu subdiaconibus, ecclesiis, vel altaribus' etc.

⁷ Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, ii. 156; Ughelli, i. 93; Migne, *P. L.* lxxviii. 1053 or cxli. 1125: 'consecrationes ecclesiarum, altarium, sacerdotum, clericorum, diaconorum [diaconarum?] seu diaconissarum totius civitatis Leonianæ . . . concedimus et confirmamus.' Ughelli reads *diaconistarum*.

⁸ Ughelli, i. 100; Migne, *P. L.* cxli. 1347 sq.: 'Confirmamus, ut presbyteri, diaconi, monachi, mansionarii, clerici cuiuscumque ordinis sint, vel dignitatis, sanctimonialis seu diaconissæ omnes, immunes sint a laicali

similar
may be
No
in Italy
abbot
end of
he paid
him, a
tery th
was d
Dacian

There

servitio.
corum, s
et confir

¹ S.
firmam
ationem
istas [*sic*]

² Ad
³ He

still stood
landists

⁴ Bar
⁵ § 7

⁶ Pul
been given
an editor

Migne, *A*
slight va

letter of
have foll

Pinius in
Antenor

gardens
S. Barna

but Maff
said, 'cu

more tha
⁷ The

inscription
⁸ Ma

similar grant of Leo IX. (1048-1054) is extant;¹ and there may easily be more.

Nor is this the only evidence of the existence of the office in Italy. In the Life of St. Nilus Junior,² a Greek, who was abbot of Grotta Ferrata, in the region of Tusculum, at the end of the tenth century,³ it is recorded that on one occasion he paid a visit to Capua.⁴ The whole city came out to meet him, and amongst them a deaconess, who was over a monastery there, with her chaplain.⁵ And again, in 1721 there was discovered at Verona⁶ the epitaph of a deaconess, Daciana by name. It is as follows:⁷

✠ DACIANA DIACONISSA
QVE . V . AN . XXXXV . M . III .
ET . FVIT . F . PALMATI . COS
ET . SOROR . VICTORINI . PRESBRI
ET . MVLT . A . PROPHETAVIT
CVM FLACCA ALVMNA
V . A . XV . DEP . IN . PACE . III . ID . AVG



There is little here to enable us to determine the date:⁸ but

servitio.' . . . 'consecrationem ecclesiarum, altarium, sacerdotum, clericorum, seu diaconistarum [*sic*] totius civitatis Leonianæ . . . concedimus et confirmamus.'

¹ S. Leonis IX. Papæ *Ep.* vii. ; Migne, *P. L.* cxliii. col. 602 *sq.* : 'confirmamus vobis vestrisque successoribus in perpetuum omnem ordinationem episcopalem, tam de presbyteris quam de diaconis, vel diaconistas [*sic*], sive subdiaconis.'

² *Acta S.S.* Boll. Sept. 26, tom. vii. p. 279 f. ; Migne, *P. G.* cxx. *init.*

³ He died about 1005. A marble tablet with his epitaph in Greek still stood 'juxta turrim ecclesiæ Cryptæ Ferratensis' when the Bolandists edited his Life.

⁴ Baronius dates it 991 (*Ann. Eccl.* xvi. 306 *sq.*, ed. Lucae, 1744).

⁵ § 79 : μία διάκονος, ἡγουμένη μοναστηρίου, σὺν τῇ ἐαυτῇ πρεσβυτέρῳ νέῳ ὄντι καὶ σφριγῶντι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ.

⁶ Published in 1721 by Scipio Maffei (to whom the stone itself had been given by the well-known scholar Girolamo Baruffaldi the elder) in an editorial note on 1 Cor. xiv. 2 in the *Complexiones* of Cassiodorus (see Migne, *P. L.* lxx. 1337), and subsequently, with further comments and slight variations, in his *Museum Veronense* (p. clxxix) and in the twentieth letter of his *Gallia Antiquitates* (*Opere*, tom. xx. pp. 192, 204, 206). We have followed the text of the *Museum Veronense*. It is also given by Pinus in the dissertation above referred to, from the papers of Giuseppe Antenore Scalabrini of Ferrara ; according to which it was found in the gardens near the church of S. Croce, where formerly was the church of S. Barnaba and a nunnery. Pinus reads PPETRAVIT for PROPHETAVIT ; but Maffei cannot be wrong in his reading of an inscription which, as he said, 'cum Veronæ sum, in conclavi ob oculos semper habeo' ; and he more than once calls special attention to *prophetavit*.

⁷ There is a palm-branch at the beginning, and two at the end of the inscription.

⁸ Maffei at first thought that PALMATI might be a mistake for

it seems probable that Daciana lived somewhat later than the deaconess at Capua.

But it will have been observed that there are signs of the same confusion in the West between the deaconess and the nun, and especially the abbess, which we have already noticed in the East. This is not the case with Anna; but the deaconess at Capua is an abbess, and the word *διάκονος* is used in her case much as it was in the East; and that Daciana was an abbess too is suggested not only by the site on which the inscription was found, but also by the description of Flacca as her *alumna*.¹ The charters of Popes given above point to a similar conclusion; in some cases the deaconess is classed with the deacon and subdeacon, in others with the nuns. Evidently as deaconesses became rarer, people became more and more vague as to what the office really meant; although it still survived, it had become a mere shadow of its former self.

How far this confusion had gone may be seen from the writings of the greatest scholar of the early twelfth century, the philosopher Abailard. In critical acumen he was equalled by none, probably also in actual range of knowledge. His passion for inquiry had already brought him into disgrace with the monks of St. Denis, when he demonstrated the falsity of the legend of their patron Dionysius the Areopagite. If any Western scholar was likely to know the facts about deaconesses, it was he. And indeed, in his *Commentary on Romans* he declares definitely enough that Phœbe was a woman-deacon,² and quotes Origen, Pseudo-Jerome, Epiphanius, and the passages of Cassiodorus and Claudius of Turin which we have already noticed. In his sermon on the Nativity of St. Stephen, preached to the nuns of the house of the Paraclete, he recognizes that women, who had been ministers (*diaconas*) of Christ, were likewise received into the order of Deacons.³ But when he comes to speak of his own

DALMATI, but afterwards came to the conclusion that Palmatus merely held the honorary consulship. Pinius points out that, according to the Roman Martyrology, a consul Palmatus was martyred in A.D. 222 with his family (see *A. SS. Boll.* May 10, p. 498), but doubts whether this can be he. The real explanation must be found in the fact that the consulate was an office in the mediæval city-state. The consuls of the Lombard cities date from the middle of the eleventh century; Palmatus must have held the office at Verona, but we have no data sufficient to enable us to trace him.

¹ Which would seem to mean that Flacca was one of her nuns.

² Abailard *In Rom.* xvi. 1; Migne, *P. L.* clxxviii. 971.

³ The passage is interesting: 'Perpendite et quanto vos honore divina gratia sublimaverit, qui vos primum suas et postmodum aposto-

day, it
repres
virtue
letters.
of nun
' those
deacor
house
as corn
We
he was
singula
other d
deacon
this we
actual
passed
the gro
women
possibl

lorum h
antiquit
mensis
mensam
nunc lev
conatus
profitem
553 sq.)

¹ *Ep*
quippe
teriales
diaconis
esse cer
institut

² *Ep*
ad omne
sufficere
infirmar
nunc ab

³ *Ac*
were ver
century
seventee
But they
Guild o
oblation
Diaconi
We hav
Church
natural

day, it is clear that he regards the abbess as the only existing representative of the order, and this *qua* abbess and not by virtue of any separate ordination. This appears from his letters. Heloissa had sought for information as to the origin of nuns. In the course of his lengthy reply he says that 'those whom we now call abbesses were formerly called deaconesses.'¹ In a second letter he lays down rules for the house of the Paraclete, and uniformly uses the word *deaconess* as corresponding exactly with abbess.²

We cannot build too much upon Abailard's language, for he was of that rather fantastic temperament which rejoices in singularity. We may be sure that he knew nothing of any other deaconesses in his day, and that he was aware that *deaconess* was used as a synonym for *abbess*. But beyond this we cannot go; and if we would know how the office actually died away, we must look elsewhere. In a word, it passed away as it became overshadowed by and merged in the growth of monastic life. As in the East, the diaconate of women was never actually abolished, but although there may possibly have been particular survivals at a later date,³ the

lorum habuit diaconas. . . . Unde et ipsas tam diaconas quam diaconissas antiquitus appellare doctores sancti consuevere. De quarum etiam mensis ordo diaconatus in prædictis viris inceptus, ad dominicam altaris mensam postmodum est translatus: ut qui diaconarum fuerant diaconi, nunc levitæ efficiantur Christi. Quibus pariter et feminas in hoc diaconatus ordine ab apostolo junctas esse, doctores sancti multis profitentur in locis.—*Serm. xxxi. (Opera, ed. Cousin, Paris, 1849, p. 553 sq.)*.

¹ *Ep.* vii. ad Heloissam (ed. Cousin, p. 121 *sq.*) [p. 134]: 'Abbatissas quippe quas nunc dicimus antiquitus diaconissas vocabant, quasi ministeriales potius quam matres. Diaconus quippe minister interpretatur, et diaconissas ab administratione potius quam a prælacione nuncupandas esse censebant, secundum quod ipse Dominus tam exemplis quam verbis instituit, dicens, "Qui major est vestrum, erit minister vester."'

² *Ep.* viii. ad Heloissam (*ib.* p. 164): 'Septem vero personas ex vobis ad omnem monasterii administrationem necessarias esse credimus atque sufficere: portariam [*one MS.* janitorem] scilicet, cellariam, vestariam, infirmariam, cantricem, sacristam, et ad extremum diaconissam, quam nunc abbatissam nominant,' and so on throughout the letter.

³ According to Richard (the author of the *Analysis Conciliorum*) there were vestiges of the office in certain churches of France in the eighteenth century; and Macer says that the office still existed in his day, *i.e.* in the seventeenth century, in Milan Cathedral (see Robinson, p. 94 *sq.*). But they may only mean monastic survivals, or societies such as the Guild of women at Milan, whose members to this day present their oblation of Bread and Wine on certain festivals. Moreri (*Dizionario, s.v. Diaconissa*) says that the office lasted longer in Spain than in Gaul. We have found no mention of the office in Spanish councils, but the Church was so closely connected with that of Gaul that the office would naturally have passed from the one to the other.

office had practically ceased to exist before the end of the twelfth century.

The final stage can be traced more clearly. There had been a custom in the West from early days that virgins might not (as a rule) receive their solemn consecration, which they received at the hands of the bishop, before the age of twenty-five.¹ At a later period, not before they were forty, there followed the solemn veiling;² and it is evident that this veil was regarded as a sign of authority and dignity, much as the dress of a *presbytis* was regarded by the abess of whom Gregory the Great writes.³ In later years girls were allowed to make their professions as nuns when they had completed their twelfth year; and they wore a veil from the first. But this veil, the *veil of profession*, was carefully distinguished from the *veil of consecration*,⁴ which was still conferred at the age of twenty-five; and this again from yet another veil which was conferred after the age of forty, and which was sometimes known as the *veil of ordination*.⁵ Now, how has this come about? The answer seems clear. As we have seen, forty was the earliest age (as a rule) for the ordination of a deaconess.⁶ The two things have been merged in one: the ordination of deaconesses has fallen into desuetude, and one of the blessings of a nun has come to be regarded as a *quasi*-ordination.

S. Antonino of Florence says that this *quasi*-ordination, formerly never conferred before the completion of the fortieth year, was in his time conferred on nuns after their benediction (or consecration). It was conferred by the Bishop, who delivered to them the Breviary; and they were thereby

¹ See the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 399), canon iv. In exceptional cases they might be veiled earlier: Conc. Milevit. (A.D. 403), canon xxvi.

² See the Council of Autun, A.D. 507, c. xix.: 'Sanctimoniales . . . ante annum ætatis suæ quadragesimum non velentur'; and the first Council of Tarragona, c. viii. (*Collectio Canonum Ecclesiæ Hispaniæ*, I. cols. 234, 305, ed. Matriti, 1808).

³ See above, p. 315.

⁴ S. Antonino (*Summa*, Pars III. tit. ii. No. 2) distinguishes between the *velum professionis*, quod datur duodecimo anno completo, and the *velum consecrationis*, quod datur anno vigesimo quinto ætatis.

⁵ Peter of Poitiers, the first commentator on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, speaks of it, but says that in his time it had fallen into abeyance: 'Est velum ordinationis in Diaconissis quadragesimo anno, sed abiit in desuetudinem' (*In Sent. lib. iv. dist. 20, litt. f.*)

⁶ See above, p. 307. Zonaras speaks of the same three stages for deaconesses: virgins are professed, then consecrated by the bishop, and then ordained deaconesses at the age of forty (*In Can. xix. Nic.*).

empow
has co
day;
some
nuns lo

It i
the dia
perhap
monast
office o

We
modern
steps w
ancient

It
deacon
Not to
Cathari
and tha
day wa
Bohem
a minis
said to

¹ 'Co
horas in
scopo da
in Matut

² 'E
conissatu
cas, & le
mitra, &
dicens:
in Eccle
Amen.'-
Antverpi

³ See
Robinson

⁴ On
gilds of
Under th
were six
were. to
(Horatio

⁵ The
can. xix.
can. ii.).

⁶ Döl
203. It
referred

empowered to say the Canonical Offices in church.¹ This has continued in the Roman communion down to our own day; and the Roman Pontifical expressly says that in some monasteries this power is customarily given to the nuns *loco Diaconissatus*.²

It is said that in the case of the Carthusian nuns, indeed, the diaconissate itself is conferred, by old custom.³ This may perhaps be the case; but whether it be so or not, these monastic customs contain the only reminiscence of the ancient office of deaconess which has survived the middle ages.⁴

We turn now to those developments of women's work in modern days which have gone under this name, and to the steps which are being taken in our own day to restore this ancient ecclesiastical order.

It has been noticed already that the office of the deaconess has always found favour with sectarian bodies. Not to speak here of those of early days,⁵ it appears that the Cathari of the middle ages had a ministry of deaconesses, and that one of their objections against the Church of their day was the fact that the office had ceased to exist.⁶ The Bohemian *Unitas Fratrum*, again, appears to have had such a ministry; for their descendants the Moravian Brethren are said to have been only reviving the office when they resolved,

¹ 'Confertur ei aliqua benedictio, ex qua accipit officium inchoandi horas in Choro et legere Homiliam quod alias non licet. Unde et ab Episcopo datur ei Breviarium ad tangendum, ubi sunt homilie de Evangelio in Matutinis' (*Summa*, Pars III. tit. ii. no. 2).

² 'Et, quia in nonnullis Monasteriis est consuetudo, quod loco Diaconissatus, virginibus consecratis datur facultas incipiendi Horas canonicas, & legendi Officium in Ecclesia; . . . tum sedet Pontifex, accepta mitra, & tradit Breuiarium illis, ambabus manibus ipsum tangentibus dicens: Accipite librum, ut incipiatis Horas canonicas, & legatis Officium in Ecclesia. In nomine Pa-tris, & Fi-lii, & Spiritus-sancti. R. Amen.'—*Pontificale Romanum*, after the *Virginum Consecratio* (ed. Antverpiæ, 1627, p. 162).

³ See an article in the *Month*, June, 1894, p. 234 (quoted by Miss Robinson, p. 98).

⁴ One curious secular parallel lasted till modern days. The *scuoli* or gilds of the *traghetto* (ferries) at Venice had officers who bore this name. Under the *bancale*, or board of five ruling officers of each society, there were six deacons for the men and six deaconesses for the women, who were to minister to the sick and dead, to collect subscriptions, etc. (Horatio F. Brown, *Life on the Lagoons*, p. 127).

⁵ The Montanists (Ps.-Ambr. *In I. Tim.* iii. 1), Paulicians (*Conc. Nic.* can. xix.), Macedonians (Soz. *H. E.* ix. 2), and Manichees (*Conc. Nîmet.* can. ii.).

⁶ Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, i. pp. 186, 203. It is possible that they derived them from the Manichees already referred to.

clergymen, who were followers of his, was held in 1575, first at Cockfield in Suffolk, and then at Cambridge; and in their conclusions, 'drawn up in an elegant Latin style by Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Travers,' provision was made for the setting apart of 'deacons of both sorts, viz. men and women,' who were to be chosen with prayer, presented to the Church and instructed in their duties, and then 'received into their office with the general prayers of the whole Church.'¹ In fact, it is clear that, as Bancroft said (though without naming him), Cartwright considered the deaconesses to be 'necessary parts of the form of that Church-government which Christ and His Apostles have appointed, . . . as necessary as either Pastor, Doctor, Elders, or Men-Deacons.'²

But apparently this was a part of Cartwright's system which did not specially commend itself to the Puritans at large, and there is nothing to suggest that the plan was carried out by the Presbyterians of the next century.³ So far as English people are concerned, it is amongst the Independents that we first hear of the deaconess as an existing Church officer. It began in Holland; and was due, almost certainly, to the intercourse between them and the Mennonites.⁴ The account is so interesting that is worth giving in full:

'At Amsterdam, before their division and breach, they were about three hundred communicants, and they had for their pastor and teacher these two eminent men before named [Mr. Francis Johnson and Mr. Henry Ainsworth], and in our time four grave men for ruling elders, and three able and godly men for deacons, one ancient widow for a deaconess, who did them service many years, though she was sixty years of age when she was chosen. She honoured her place and was an ornament to the congregation. She usually sat in a convenient place in the congregation, with a little birchen rod in her hand, and kept little children in great awe from disturbing the congregation. She did frequently visit the sick and weak, especially women, and, as there was need, called out maids and young women to watch and do them other help as their necessity did require; and if they were poor, she would gather relief for them of

¹ Neal, *History of the Puritans*, i. 227 (ed. 1837). The title of the regulation is: 'Of Collectors for the Poor, or Deacons.'

² Bancroft, *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, p. 177 (quoted in Howson, *Deaconesses*, p. 59).

³ There is nothing about it in the *Directory of Church-Government*; and needless to say, the Scottish Presbyterians of the Westminster Assembly, followers of the author of *The Monstrous Regiment of Women*, would have none of it.

⁴ Arber, *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, p. 137 sq.; Collins, *The English Reformation and its Consequences*, p. 194.

those that were able, or acquaint the deacons; and she was obeyed as a mother in Israel and an officer of Christ.¹

Such was the Independent deaconess in Amsterdam; and so valuable was she accounted that she was presently introduced into England. A very rare tract, published in 1642, by John Robinson, formerly minister of the congregation at Leyden, describes the organization of the Independent congregations of that date. Amongst the officers mentioned are the deaconesses or widows, who are 'to attend the sick and impotent with compassion and cheerfulness.'² A like organization seems to have continued amongst the sects having an independent basis for some time longer; and although it died out as they ceased to realize the Church as a polity, yet so widespread was it at one time that even in the Society of Friends there was a tendency to regard their female workers as deaconesses.³ Not only so: the later Non-jurors were led, by their study of Christian antiquity, to desire the revival of the office. No doubt it was never used, but in Dr. Deacon's *Complete Collection of Devotions*, published in 1734, there is given 'The Form and Manner of Ordaining Deaconesses.'⁴

So far (at least, with the exception of the Quakers above mentioned) the diaconate of women had been regarded as a strictly ecclesiastical office, and as a part of the properly

¹ Governor William Bradford, *A Dialogue, or the Sum of a Conference between some Young Men born in New England, and sundry Ancient Men that came out of Holland and of Old England: Anno Domini 1648*. (See A. Young, *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers*, p. 455 sq., Boston, 1841).

² John Robinson, *A Brief Catechism concerning Church Government*, quoted in Barclay, *Inner Life*, p. 104 n.

³ Sewell, *History of the Quakers*, iii. 399 (ed. 1811). Some of the women 'as deaconesses, met together at set times to provide for sick families and sick people that were in want' (quoted by Howson, *Deaconesses*, p. 234). At a yet earlier date the ministry of women had been found to need control. The following letter from Edward Burrough to George Fox, dated 1656, is preserved amongst the papers at Devonshire House: 'This little short maid that comes to thee, she has been this long while abroad, and in her there is little or no service as in the ministry. It were well to be laid on her to be a servant somewhere. That is more her place. I leave it to thee. Friends where she has been have been burdened by her' (printed in Barclay, *Inner Life*, p. 345).

⁴ Reprinted by Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vi. 293 sq. A deaconess is not to be ordained before the age of forty 'unless upon a particular occasion, of which the Bishop is to be judge'; and she is to assist at the baptism of women, to instruct children and women before baptism, to supervise the women in Church and rebuke and correct those who misbehave, and 'to introduce any woman who wanteth to make application to a Deacon, Presbyter, or Bishop.'

organ
nature
depend
by the
formed
they b
ministe
office v
century
forms o
thing o
institut
formed

In
pastor
Emper
1062, i
have fa
have co
whom h
his imp
form a
work an
grew an
expand
which s
of early
And th
for the
was star
1842²;
kind wa
have sp
tinent;
have be
large an

But
demarca

¹ Ther
(London,
mously, b
received p
conesses, p

² How

⁴ A ful
Dr. Schäff

organized ministry. It is true, of course, that from the very nature of the case these Mennonite, or Presbyterian, or Independent 'deaconesses' could not be admitted to their office by the laying on of the hands of the bishop. But they formed a definite part of the ministry of the church to which they belonged, they stood on the same footing with the male ministers, and were, like them, regularly admitted to their office with the prayers of the congregation. But the present century, in which so great an impulse has been given to all forms of women's work, has seen the inauguration of something of quite a different kind, in the so-called deaconess-institutions which are now in existence in most of the Reformed Churches on the Continent.

In the year 1833 Dr. Fleidner, the devoted Lutheran pastor of Kaiserwerth in the Rhineland, the place whence the Emperor Henry IV was abducted by Anno of Cologne in 1062, inaugurated a work for women which was destined to have far-reaching results. The original impetus appears to have come from Dr. Fleidner's intimacy with Elizabeth Fry, whom he met whilst seeking funds in England for the relief of his impoverished congregation; and the original plan was to form a society of women who should devote themselves to work amongst discharged female prisoners. But the project grew and spread, and little by little Dr. Fleidner's own ideas expanded. He began to think of forming an organization which should supply the place of the deaconesses or widows of early days—for they were one and the same thing to him. And thus there was organized the 'Society of Deaconesses for the Rhenish Provinces of Westphalia.'¹ A similar society was started independently at Strasburg by Pastor Härter in 1842²; and about the same time an institution of the same kind was founded at Paris by M. Vermiel.³ Since then they have sprung up in great numbers, and in all parts of the Continent;⁴ and there is no reason to doubt that wherever they have been founded they have been the means of doing a large amount of very good work.

But as we have already remarked, there is a sharp line of demarcation between the earlier Protestant 'deaconesses' and

¹ There is an interesting *Account of the Institution for Deaconesses* (London, 1851) which is still worth referring to. It was published anonymously, but is known to have been by Miss Florence Nightingale, who received part of her training at Kaiserwerth. See also Howson, *Deaconesses*, pp. 70-85.

² Howson, *op. cit.* p. 87 sq.

³ *Ib.* p. 208 sq.

⁴ A full list, with the dates of foundation in most cases, is given in Dr. Schäfer's article (Herzog-Hauck, iv. 615 sq.).

the members of these institutions. In the first place, whereas the former were a distinct and regular part of the ministry of the bodies to which they belonged, the latter are distinctly to be regarded as a voluntary organization of the laity. Again, whereas the former had a clear individual status of their own, the latter are primarily members of an institution. In fact, to sum up the whole matter in a few words, the modern Continental deaconess-institutions have been formed on the basis of sisterhoods, *minus* the vows. The real underlying idea is that the deaconesses are Protestant 'Sisters of Mercy' or 'Sisters of Charity,' freed from the dangers and the corruptions of Popery, as people expressed it. And their real analogy, as Pankowski acutely perceived,¹ is with the professed nuns of the Church, and not with the deaconesses of early days.

Of this fact there can be no real doubt. It is true that both Pastor Fleidner and Pastor Härter, and possibly others too, had turned their attention to the deaconesses of old, and may have persuaded themselves that they were restoring officers of a similar kind. It is true that, in Westphalia and some other Lutheran provinces, a certain amount of official recognition is given to the deaconess-institutions on the part of the Lutheran body.² It is also true that, in some at any rate of the Lutheran deaconess-institutions, the 'deaconesses' are admitted to their office, after training, by a formal service of dedication, with a laying on of hands (*Einsegnung*).³ But no attempt is made to confer any *character* thereby; the 'deaconesses' are simply admitted, with a religious service of a private nature, into a voluntary society for common life and work, which they may leave at the call of more urgent duties. And where there is a conditional undertaking not to leave the work for a term of years, it is avowedly based upon the claim which the society has upon its members in return for its work of training them.⁴

Moreover, if the ancient deaconess was in the mind of the founders, it is no less clear that the modern 'Sister of Mercy' was too. They took every precaution to avoid being sus-

¹ *Op. cit.* § 57: 'Hæc institutio non est instauratio illarum diaconissarum veteris ecclesiæ . . . sed potius imitatio muneris, quod obeunt in ecclesia catholica quæ dicuntur sorores a misericordia.'

² Howson, *Deaconesses*, p. 74, and Dr. Schäfer's article.

³ In which, in some cases, the elder deaconesses took part! (Howson, *Deaconesses*, p. 92).

⁴ At Kaiserwerth the promised period of service was five years; but there was 'perfect liberty to retire at any time if new circumstances should urgently require it' (*ib.* 101 n).

pected
weighed
was to
through
some of
and vow
tive clo
in char
name L
being a
When
instituti
calling t
Dr. Flei
At Pari
longed
charité
literatur
Dr. Ho
account
the new
place w
of wome

Mea
and his
Englan
the Eng
work on
Fry's in
'Evang
at Tott
this, in
founded
W. Pen

¹ This
the name

² The
Schäfer's
in three
informati

³ See,
deaconess
Visitors o
other,' p.
urge that
astical rec
be revived

pected of Popery ; and the points which were most carefully weighed were just those points in which the new institution was to be raised above suspicion. In fact, the real pattern throughout was the sisterhood of the Church denuded of some of its most distinctive features. For noviciate, superiors, and vows are alike dispensed with ; and although a distinctive clothing was adopted, it was made as different as possible in character from those of the religious orders. Even the name *Diakonissin* was little more than an accidental feature, being adopted largely in default of a better description. When Elizabeth Fry was preparing to found her similar institution in Devonshire Square,¹ she only abstained from calling the members of it *Protestant Sisters of Charity* owing to Dr. Fleidner's advice that such a description was undesirable. At Paris, the name *diaconesse* was only adopted after prolonged consideration, the title at first proposed being *sœur de charité protestante*. In a word, no careful reader of the literature of the time when they were founded, or even of Dr. Howson's *Deaconesses*, which contains the best general account in English of their early history,² can fail to see that the new institution is nothing but an attempt to supply the place which was supplied elsewhere by religious communities of women.³

Meanwhile, the work which had been done by Dr. Fleidner and his fellow pioneers had not been without its effect in England ; and before long attempts were made, from within the English Church as well as outside, to organize women's work on a similar basis. We have already referred to Mrs. Fry's institution in Devonshire Square. In 1867 a so-called 'Evangelical Protestant Deaconesses' Institution' was founded at Tottenham, where it is still at work. And even before this, in 1860, a small training college for women had been founded at Barnet by an English clergyman, the Reverend W. Pennefather.⁴ He afterwards removed it to London,

¹ This institution, founded in 1840, is still doing excellent work under the name of the Nursing Sisters' Institution.

² The fullest account in German, and by far the best, is Dr. Theodor Schäfer's *Die weibliche Diakonie in ihrem ganzen Umfang dargestellt*, in three volumes (second edition, Stuttgart, 1887-94). Much of its information is compressed into his article in Herzog-Hauck.

³ See, for instance, Dr. Howson's definition of the deaconess : 'By deaconesses we understand something contrasted with desultory Lady Visitors on the one hand, and with strictly conventual Sisterhoods on the other,' p. 2 ; and see pp. 148-50. The whole object of his book was to urge that the deaconess movement should receive 'some further ecclesiastical recognition,' rather than that an ancient ecclesiastical order should be revived.

⁴ Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 108.

where it has grown into the extensive 'Mildmay Missions,' with a large Deaconess-Institution and many other kindred works.

But it was obvious from the first that institutions of this kind could not loyally go on working in the English Church without proper episcopal sanction and supervision, any more than sisterhoods could. Even granting that they were purely voluntary associations, and their title of 'deaconess' self-imposed and meaningless, there could be no question that such masquerading was in itself absurd, and in its tendencies destructive. Meanwhile, too, the need for some such organized women's work, quite apart from that of sisterhoods, was ever more widely felt; whilst in England, more than elsewhere, the revival of the ancient office of deaconess was the object aimed at. The matter engaged the attention of Convocation in the years from 1858 to 1862; and whilst the Lower House desired that a joint committee might be appointed to consider the subject, and to recommend what steps should be taken, the Upper House, with its usual far-seeing wisdom and calm deliberation, perceived that the time had not yet come for action. For this decision, as for many similar ones which have preserved us from the hasty inconsiderateness of the moment, we cannot be too thankful. One shudders to think of the shapeless and unnatural erection with which we might have been burdened had the Lower House had its way.

But although the time had not yet come for action on the part of the Church, in the direction of a revival of the ancient order of deaconesses, there was nothing to prevent the adoption in the English Church of methods of work which had proved satisfactory elsewhere—the workers being admitted to their office, not by private persons, but by the Bishop. And in 1861 the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait), acting on his own authority, thought good to lay hands on Miss Elizabeth Ferard, thus setting her apart as a (titular) deaconess. At the same time the first diocesan deaconess-institution was inaugurated in the north of London, Deaconess Elizabeth Ferard being its first head, and its first chaplain being Mr. Pelham Dale. Since then similar institutions have been founded in many other dioceses, both at home and abroad,¹ and the parish deaconess is now a familiar feature of Anglican Church life.

¹ A full list of such institutions in England and Wales will be found in the *Church Year Book*, or in Appendix E of Miss Robinson's book. Information with regard to the colonies is given at page 125 *sq.* of the latter.

By
the Ch
sugges
up, and
bishop
by a B
that he
had no
to the
thority
'Sugge
forward
of Can
that th
howeve
of eigh
Convoc
made v
deacon
follows

'Th
formed
their eff
revived,
Instituti
parishes

The
synodic
not, so

¹ Giv
² One
a deacon
in view i
A. B." (C
"A. B.,
³ Giv
⁴ The
⁵ Two
the Church
p. 222), i
may be
age of 2
to be un
work und
resign he
be 'reap
the dioc
appointm

By degrees, too, they have received fuller recognition from the Church at large. In 1871 a body of 'Principles and Rules suggested for adoption in the Church of England,'¹ was drawn up, and signed by the two archbishops and eighteen of the bishops. A deaconess is here defined as 'a woman set apart by a Bishop, under that title, for service in the Church'; so that henceforward no person could loyally use the title who had not thus been set apart. Further provisions are made as to the relations of the deaconess to those under whose authority she may be working from time to time, and a number of 'Suggested Rules' are added.² The subject was again brought forward more than once in the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, but it was not until twenty years afterwards that the time seemed ripe for further action. When it came, however, it was a distinct step in advance. In 1891 a series of eight 'Resolutions'³ upon the subject was passed by the Convocation of Canterbury, in which further provisions are made with regard to the probation, admission, and work of deaconesses. And the first of these resolutions speaks as follows with regard to what had been already done:

'That Deaconesses having, according to the best authorities, formed an order of ministry in the early Church, and having proved their efficiency in the Anglican Church, *whenever the order has been revived*,⁴ it is desirable to encourage the formation of Deaconess Institutions and the work of Deaconesses in our dioceses and parishes.'

The Anglican 'deaconess' has thus received something of synodical recognition in the Province of Canterbury,⁵ though not, so far as we are aware, in that of York. But it is clear

¹ Given by Miss Robinson in Appendix D.

² One of these 'suggested rules' is as follows: 'It is desirable that a deaconess should not drop the use of her surname; and with this end in view it is suggested that her official designation should be "*Deaconess A. B.*" (Christian and Surname), and her official signature should be "*A. B., Deaconess.*"'

³ Given by Miss Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 218.

⁴ The *italics* are ours.

⁵ Two years before this, a canon on the subject had been passed by the Church of the United States (tit. i. can. 10: given by Miss Robinson, p. 222), in which it is provided that properly qualified unmarried women may be 'appointed to the office of Deaconess' by any bishop after the age of 25, to be set apart with an 'appropriate religious service,' and to be under the direct authority of the Bishop when not engaged in work under the rector of a parish. Such a deaconess may 'at any time resign her office,' but no deaconess who has so resigned her office shall be 'reappointed thereto, unless there be, in the judgment of the Bishop of the diocese where she resigned her office, weighty cause for such re-appointment.'

that the whole feeling of the Anglican Communion is in its favour. And in the Lambeth Conference of 1897, not only is the office dealt with in a Report upon the subject of Religious Communities,¹ but the eleventh of the 'Resolutions formally adopted by the Conference' is as follows:

'That this Conference recognizes with thankfulness the revival alike of Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods and of the office of Deaconess, in our branch of the Church, and commends to the attention of the Church the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the Relation of the Religious Communities to the Episcopate.'²

The new institution has thus received the approval of the Church in no small measure: principles and rules respecting it have been 'suggested for adoption' by the two English archbishops and a majority of the bishops; it has received the formal recognition of the Convocation of Canterbury; and, although this gives it no new *canonical* standing, it has received the cordial approval of a far greater assembly, the Lambeth Conference of 1897. But it will be observed that some of the passages which we have quoted go further than this. The first resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury speaks of the order of deaconesses as having been *revived*; so does the eleventh resolution of the Lambeth Conference; whilst the Report of its Committee states, by implication, that the deaconess holds 'a position in the Church similar to that which belonged to the deaconess of early days.'³ Now neither of these passages explicitly declares that the modern deaconess holds the same position as that held by the deaconess in early days, or that she has actually received orders; yet they might easily be taken to mean this.⁴ And in fact the Bishop of Winchester has ventured yet further; for in the kindly and otherwise beautiful 'Introduction' which he contributes to Miss Robinson's book he actually goes so far as to speak of the 'band of trained and faithful women bearing the sacred commission of the diaconate'⁵ in the two dioceses over which he has ruled.

¹ *Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with the Resolutions and Reports*, p. 59 sq.; Miss Robinson, p. 219.

² *Encyclical Letter, &c.*, p. 35.

³ *Ibid.* p. 60.

⁴ In the address to the people in the *Form for admitting Deaconesses*, as used in some dioceses (e.g. London and Rochester) it is explicitly stated that 'in the Primitive Church there was a custom to admit [as it seems, *East London*] publicly and in the sight of the congregation [and, *E. L.*], by the authority of the Bishop, women of godly life and conversation, to be Deaconesses or Servants of the Church; and we are here met together that we may receive *her* who is now presented to us to be admitted into this ancient order,' &c. Oddly enough, this strange exhortation *precedes* the presentation of the candidates to the Bishop!

⁵ *Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. xi. The *italics* are ours.

It
the m
analog
a fact,
orders
viction
that is
at the
on the
Even t
conclu
amount
other t
settled
actual
precise

Wi
what h
very co
and in
ranked
and sin
of the
cian he
virgins
any rat
set apa
κλήρος,

Nov
We ven
(1) It i
institut
a simila
on the
that the
entirely

(2)
Reform
ance in
restorat
could o

¹ It is
son, p. 73
was an o
communi
VOL.

It therefore becomes important to ask whether, as a fact, the modern deaconess *does* hold a position in any way analogous to that of the deaconess of early days: whether, as a fact, women have at the present time a true part in the orders of the Church. We are aware that this is the conviction of a large number of the deaconesses themselves; but that is hardly the point. In the book which we have placed at the head of this article, Miss Robinson writes throughout on the same assumption; but that is not the point either. Even the Resolution of the Bishops upon the subject is not conclusive; for after all, this is a question of fact, and no amount of saying that people are deaconesses can make them other than what they actually are. The question can only be settled by the consideration of two points: (a) What was the actual position of the ancient deaconess; and (b) What is the precise nature of the setting apart of the modern deaconess?

With regard to the first point, the answer is clear from what has been said already. There were, no doubt, certain very considerable variations in her *status* from time to time and in different parts of the Church: at some periods she ranked after the men-deacons, and at others after the readers and singers; in general she was 'ordained' in the fullest sense of the word, whilst in Lower Egypt, and amongst the Paulician heretics, she was merely admitted like the widows and virgins, and (in some cases at least) the doorkeepers. But at any rate, wherever she existed, the ancient deaconess was always set apart for a life-long ministry,¹ formed a definite part of the *κλήρος*, and had certain definitely 'clerical' duties to perform.

Now, is this the case with regard to the modern deaconess? We venture to think that the evidence goes the other way. (1) It must be borne in mind that we are dealing with an institution which came into being through direct imitation of a similar institution already existing in the Reformed bodies on the Continent. We may not therefore conclude too rashly that the members of such an institution are also something entirely different.

(2) Further, the fact must not be forgotten that at the Reformation the orders below the diaconate fell into abeyance in the English Church. However desirable their restoration may be, it can hardly be claimed that a new order could come into existence unconsciously, and without a

¹ It is not accurate to say with regard to the ancient deaconess (Robinson, p. 73) that 'to marry was her equivalent to leaving the ministry.' It was an offence which was punished by deposition and expulsion from communion.

deliberate act on the part of the Church. But it would puzzle anyone to say when this was done with regard to the modern deaconess. It would be truer by far to say that such action as has at present been taken points to an assumption that the ancient deaconess was *not* in orders, followed by a resolve to restore an office of the same nature.

(3) Nor can it be contended that an episcopal blessing for a particular work, with laying on of hands, has of necessity conferred a new order on the recipient. Such a blessing might easily be given to any lay person for any lay work which was about to be entrusted to him.

(4) Nor is there anything in the form itself which suggests that a new order is being conferred. It varies somewhat in different dioceses, but the general character is much the same in those which we have examined. That in use in the diocese of Rochester may serve as a specimen. The service takes place after the Nicene Creed, or after the Third Collect, or as may be appointed: the candidates are commended by the Bishop to the prayers of the people, then presented to him and examined, and the *Veni Creator* is sung over them:

'The Bishop shall then lay his hands upon the head of the person to be made Deaconess, and solemnly bless her, after the following manner:

God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, bless, preserve, and sanctify you; and so fill you with all spiritual benediction and grace, with all faith, wisdom, and humility, that you may serve before Him to the glory of His great Name, and to the benefit of His Church and people; and make you faithful unto death, and give you the crown of everlasting life. Amen.

N. or M., I admit thee to the office of Deaconess, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then shall the Bishop give the Cross to the Deaconess, saying:

Receive and wear this Cross, a symbol of thy profession as Deaconess. Be not ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified; bear ever in thy heart the remembrance of His love who died on the Cross for thee. Amen.¹

¹ The East London form is much the same, excepting that the *Veni Creator* is omitted. In the Winchester form the blessing is omitted, and a prayer for the candidates precedes the laying on of hands. In the diocese of Ely the form is somewhat different:

'Then shall the Bishop lay his hands on the head of each person to be made Deaconess and say:

I admit thee, dearly beloved, to the office of Deaconess, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then shall follow the Blessing.

God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, bless you both in body and soul with all temporal and eternal blessing, now, henceforth and for evermore. Amen.²

N
migh
appo
admi

(5)

deaco

The

funct

what

not d

(6)

office

indee

dioces

for th

the C

be rel

the 'I

that

'A

Deaco

which

We h

Churc

accord

be ask

Ely, a

'In

relinqu

space o

the help

Lar

improv

declare

her ob

shown.

how it

by whi

who de

their o

Miss I

Now this form, solemn as it is, contains nothing which might not perfectly well be used, *mutatis mutandis*, in the appointment of a lay reader or a diocesan reader, or in the admission of a lay member of a cathedral body.

(5) Nor is there anything in the work of the modern deaconess to suggest that she has received a new order. The deaconess of early days had definite ecclesiastical functions to perform; the modern deaconess has nothing whatever to do which is not distinctly lay work, and which is not done by other lay women.

(6) Above all, the modern deaconess is no more than the officer of a particular diocese; an officer formally recognized, indeed, in the province of Canterbury, but existing in any diocese only at the wish or by the sufferance of the Bishop for the time being. She has no definite permanent place in the Church. She may at any moment resign her office, or be relieved of it by the Bishop. This was definitely stated in the 'Principles and Rules' of 1871, in which it is recommended that

'A Deaconess shall be at liberty to resign her commission as Deaconess, or may be deprived of it by the Bishop of the diocese in which she is working.'¹

We have already noticed that the canon of the American Church upon the subject contains a similar provision. In accordance with this principle, the following question used to be asked of the candidates for the office in the diocese of Ely, and we believe in other dioceses too:

'Inasmuch as this office is not to be lightly undertaken or relinquished, it is [*sic*] your present purpose to continue in it *for the space of three years at the least*?² *Answer.* I purpose to do so by the help of God.'

Latterly, we are glad to say, there has been a considerable improvement in this matter, and the Resolutions of 1891 only declare 'That a Deaconess so admitted may be released from her obligations by the Bishop, if he thinks fit, upon cause shown.'³ This is more satisfactory, though we cannot but ask how it affects those who were set apart under a 'Principle' by which they were 'at liberty to resign their commission,' or who declared it to be their 'present' purpose to continue in their office for three years. And even so, it is not enough. Miss Robinson may not be far wrong in saying that 'all

¹ *Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. 215.

² The words in *italics* are not now used.

³ *Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. 218.

English deaconesses are united¹ as to the permanence of their calling; but that is not the point. The question is, not whether they intend to persevere, but how far they are bound; not how far they have devoted themselves, but how great an obligation has been placed upon them. There is nothing to prevent the removal of such a (normally) lifelong obligation by the authority which imposed it; and we are of course aware that minor orders, formerly regarded as indelible,² have been made matter for dispensations in the Roman communion since the time of Innocent III. If at some future time the bishops should definitely admit women to an office of a permanent character (even though dispensable in cases of emergency), such as should give them a definite place in the ranks of the clergy, this would place them in a position analogous to that of the ancient deaconess. But such action would not be retrospective, and could have no effect upon those who had already been set apart on an entirely different basis: viz. the basis of a common life of service without any guarantee of permanence.

That some such further action is desirable we are convinced; for the present position of the deaconess is a somewhat anomalous one. *Qua* deaconess, she is neither one thing nor the other—neither a minister of the Church in any strict sense nor a professed sister, though a good deal like both. In fact, she is something like Rudyard Kipling's marine:

'E isn't one o' the reg'lar Line, nor 'e isn't one of the crew.
'E's a kind of a giddy harumfrodite,—soldier and sailor too !'

But the cases are not at all parallel. It is the very nature of the marine to occupy this intermediate position; whereas it cannot be too clearly recognized that the deaconess and the professed sister are entirely distinct in their aim: the former is ministerial, the latter is 'religious.' A deaconess may also, no doubt, be a professed nun, just as a priest or a deacon may also be a monk; and we believe that the Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference is quite right in thinking that there is room for both 'religious' and 'secular' deaconesses.³ But the two things are quite distinct in kind. A deaconess is not 'professed' because she is a deaconess, nor does a professed sister hold any ministerial office in the Church because she is professed. No doubt it is highly expedient that a deaconess should be unmarried, and in many

¹ *Ministry of Deaconesses*, p. 151.

² See the seventh canon of the Council of Chalcedon.

³ See § 3 of the Report: *Encyclical Letter* &c. p. 61.

cases
be con-

At
is a t
cariou
analog
much
this;
it wer
the lea
profess
calling
ence'
but to
and ot
leading
was ac

We
dispara
by a n
once m
attaine
already
Confer
Report
further
deacon
terial li
to that
deacon
what a
and (c)
they are

¹ It w
be unmar
case: it
the same
have seen
Rhadege
became b
was a dea
ing the of

cases that she should be professed ; but neither of these can be considered as an *essential* part of her office.¹

At present the whole subject is complicated because there is a tendency—natural enough in view of their present precarious position—for deaconesses to fashion their life on the analogy of the life of professed nuns. Those who have seen much of their work in different parishes may have noticed this ; and there have been cases—they could be produced if it were necessary—in which grave misunderstanding, to say the least, has been caused by a deaconess apeing the ways of professed nuns : wearing a colourable imitation of their dress ; calling herself ‘ Sister ’ this or that ; speaking of the ‘ obedience ’ which she owes, not to the bishop and the parish priest, but to the deaconess-institution in which she was trained ; and otherwise acting in a way that is equally silly and misleading, however natural it might be in the case of one who was actually under vows.

We need hardly say that in all this we have no desire to disparage the work which is being done at the present time by a noble and self-sacrificing body of women ; but we desire once more to emphasize the fact that this agency has not yet attained its full development. In the Report which they have already issued, the Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference express their intention of issuing a ‘ further Report ’ at a later date. Is it too much to hope that this further Report may suggest means for securing for the deaconess of the future (*a*) a definite position in the ministerial life of the Church, with the obligations corresponding to that position ; (*b*) definite limitations of the sphere of the deaconess-institution, as being to the deaconess precisely what a theological college is to a person in Holy Orders ; and (*c*) a clear recognition of the fact that, *qua* deaconesses, they are not Sisters, but simply ordinary secular folk ?

¹ It was the old canonical rule of the East that a deaconess should be unmarried or a widow. But this is not based upon the nature of the case : it is merely a canonical provision, and may be set aside in just the same way as old regulations enjoining celibacy upon the clergy. We have seen that one married woman separated from her husband (Queen Rhadegund) was ordained a deaconess, and that the wives of those who became bishops might be so ordained. And if, as some think, Priscilla was a deaconess, there is very early precedent for a married woman holding the office.

ART. III.—HALL'S 'THE KENOTIC THEORY.'

The Kenotic Theory considered with particular reference to its Anglican Forms and Arguments. By the Rev. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Instructor of Dogmatic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois. (New York, London, and Bombay, 1898.)

THERE are three points of view from which the various forms of the theory known as 'kenoticism' may be considered. They may be brought to the test of the teaching of Holy Scripture. They may be examined in the light of the historical theology of the Christian Church. They may be regarded in their bearing on the needs of human life.

Each of these three points of view imperatively demands two truths about the Incarnation. They require, first, the assertion of the true and complete Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. They require, in the second place, the assertion that His Manhood was and is no less true and complete than His Godhead. Further consideration shows that these two natures must not be confused, and that there must be one Divine Person whose natures they are.

We have on several occasions treated these requirements at length, and we have more than once shown, with some degree of fulness, that any form of the 'kenotic theory,' as impairing the Deity of our Blessed Lord, is contrary to Holy Scripture, contradicts historical Christian beliefs, and destroys the practical value of the Incarnation.¹

It is a matter of much satisfaction to find that the dangerous opinions which we have condemned are vigorously refuted in a recently published book entitled *The Kenotic Theory*, by Dr. Hall, of Chicago. We desire to express our appreciation of Dr. Hall's many kind references to the articles which have appeared in our pages, but the main ground of our satisfaction is in the clearness and ability with which he sets forth important truth. His book is valuable and opportune. It is opportune because of the large numbers of persons both in England and America who are recklessly adopting 'kenotic' theories, less in most cases because they have really studied and thought out the subject than because

¹ See especially October 1891 ('Our Lord's Knowledge as Man'), January 1896 ('Canon Gore on the Incarnation and the Eucharist'), October 1896 ('Otley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*'), July 1897 ('Our Lord's Divine and Human Knowledge'), October 1897 ('The Sacred Manhood of the Son of God').

of the
as ably
Christia
indeed,
is to ta
them or
'Ke
essentia
assertio
to acqu
Divine.
doned I
Trinity,
earth.
it repres
truth an
attribut
In the
guished
ance in
all His
and in
of them
it contra
God; in
some of
cost of a
Word as
and ruli
teaching
nature a
abandon
One c
on Subje
ledgmen
matter o
schoolme
with whi
some of
torical b
tion a pa
'Nicer
placing th
¹ For t
of Christ i

of the influence of some individual teacher. It is valuable as ably defending truth which is so near to the heart of the Christian system that to deny it is to imperil all the rest. For, indeed, to accept even the more moderate forms of 'kenoticism' is to take the feet off solid and level ground and to put them on a slippery slope which ends in unbelief.

'Kenoticism' embraces many degrees of error. The essential feature, common to all the different forms, is the assertion that in the Incarnation the Son of God, in addition to acquiring what is human, abandoned something which is Divine. In one form, it says that the Eternal Word abandoned His divine life and functions in the being of the Holy Trinity, the ordering of the universe, and His human life on earth. In another form, attempting to divide the indivisible, it represents Him as having retained His moral attributes of truth and love, and as having abandoned His 'physical' attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. In the shape in which it has been formulated by a distinguished English Churchman, and has received most acceptance in the English Church, it supposes that He retained all His divine attributes in the being of the Holy Trinity and in the ordering of the universe, but abandoned some of them within the sphere of the Incarnation. In all its forms it contradicts the vital truth of the immutability of Almighty God; in that we have mentioned last it attempts to avoid some of the terrible consequences of the other forms at the cost of approximating to a Nestorian separation between the Word as incarnate and the Word as living the life of God and ruling the universe. Against them all the historical teaching of the Church of Christ declares that in acquiring nature and attributes which are human the Son of God abandoned no attribute which is divine.

One of the startling features of Canon Gore's *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation* was his acknowledgment that, with three exceptions—no one of which, as a matter of fact, really supported his position—the Fathers and schoolmen taught concerning the Incarnation in a manner with which his theory was inconsistent. Dr. Hall examines some of the grounds on which such an abandonment of historical belief may be based. In the course of this examination a passage occurs in which he says:

'Nicene theology was content to assert both sides of the truth, placing the divine and human predicates of our Lord's Person in

¹ For this use of the word 'physical' see, e.g., Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 476-7.

juxtaposition, without attempting the impossible task of explaining their harmony. This has been criticized, but the criticism is unwarranted. . . . It is in fact the true test of theological balance and a Catholic temper to hold opposite truths in close connexion with each other. Calvinists fasten their attention exclusively upon the almighty sovereignty and will of God, and Pelagians magnify the integrity and freedom of man's will. But Catholic theologians place these truths in juxtaposition and hold them together, making the manner of their holding each truth such as to allow for the other, and recognizing their inability to make an explanation of their harmony. It cannot be wrong to hold in connexion with each other truths found in Scripture. To say we may not put such truths in juxtaposition seems to imply that they are mutually contradictory. Those who object to such juxtapositions are likely to end in preferring one truth at the expense of the other. And this is the fault of the modern kenoticists. They prefer to emphasize the reality of our Lord's Manhood regardless of His Godhead and divine attributes, and in their one-sidedness interpret the theological balance of Athanasian writers as involving a disparagement of the truth which they themselves exaggerate' (pp. 83-5).

It was an objection which Canon Gore made against an article which appeared in our own pages that it acquiesced in the 'mere juxtaposition of the two consciousnesses in our Lord.'¹ And, what is of more importance, he depreciated the work of the Council of Chalcedon on a similar ground:

'The definition of Chalcedon,' he wrote, 'affirmed the juxtaposition of the divine and human natures in Christ each with its separate and distinct operation, but contributed nothing positive towards the solution of the question: how is this duality of natures and operations related to the unity of the person? How, for example, did the one person Christ, being God, exercise a human consciousness, involving as it does human limitations? The tendency was to regard the divine and human nature simply as placed side by side; to speak of Christ as acting now in the one and now in the other—or, more specifically, to attribute the powerful works and words of the Incarnate Person to His Godhead, and His sufferings and "humble" sayings to His manhood.'²

In accordance with this line of thought, St. Leo's magnificent description of the varying operations of the Divine Person of our Lord³ in His two natures was selected by Canon Gore as a representative instance of the way in which it is inaccurate to speak of the Incarnation.⁴ In taking up this position he was able to claim the support of an

¹ Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, p. 222, note 1.

² *Ibid.* pp. 162-3.

³ St. Leo, *Ep.* xxviii. 4.

⁴ Gore, *op. cit.* pp. 163-6.

unfortun
Durham

'It is u
patristic
acting n

In a la
explain
on the
the reje

'both b
Saviour
weakness
assume.'

And D
aside in

'He was
expressio
divine e
rupted t
tions of

We
the *Ton*
tions o
underlie
make c
they ar
acts wh
speaks
both th
the sam
was div
was hun
theologi
writing
English

¹ We
² On
this sente
³ Mas
⁴ St.
munione
⁵ *Ibid*
intelligen
⁶ *Ibid*
agerentur

unfortunate sentence in a valuable work by the Bishop of Durham, in which the Bishop said :

'It is unscriptural, though the practice is supported by strong patristic authority, to regard the Lord during His historic life as acting now by His human and now by His divine nature only.'¹

In a later work by Dr. Mason, in which he was careful to explain that he had not read either of Canon Gore's books on the subject, very much the same attitude was adopted in the rejection of the idea held

'both by ancient and modern writers, that in His miracles our Saviour was exercising His divine power and in His sufferings the weakness of the creaturely nature which He had vouchsafed to assume.'

And Dr. Mason went on to describe the belief which he put aside in the following terms :

'He was alternately acting in two capacities, if I may use such an expression. He interrupted from time to time the exhibition of His divine energy in order to give His humanity its turn ;² or He interrupted the normal homeliness of a human life by wondrous vindications of His Godhead.'³

We should have thought that one attentive reading of the *Tome* of St. Leo might have prevented such misconceptions of his belief and that of other Fathers as evidently underlie statements of this kind. St. Leo is very careful to make clear that, while the two natures are never confused, they are never separated. 'Each form,' he says, 'does the acts which belong to it in communion with the other.'⁴ He speaks of the 'unity which is to be understood as existing in both the natures.'⁵ He writes elsewhere, evidently expressing the same idea as in the *Tome*, that 'neither was that which was divine done without the manhood, nor was that which was human done without the Godhead.'⁶ As so accurate a theologian and careful a student of St. Leo as Dr. Bright, writing before the rise of the present controversy in the English Church, has pointed out, 'Leo fully acknowledges

¹ Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 66.

² On a previous occasion we protested against the expression used in this sentence : see *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1897, p. 495.

³ Mason, *The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth*, pp. 84-5.

⁴ St. Leo, *Ep.* xxviii. 4 : 'Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est.'

⁵ *Ibid.* 5 : 'Propter hanc ergo unitatem personæ in utraque natura intelligendam.'

⁶ *Ibid.* *Ep.* cxxiv. 7 : 'Ut nec sine homine divina nec sine Deo agerentur humana.'

that personal singleness which was matter of supreme interest to Cyril ; ' the words of Leo ' lay stress on the close inter-communion of the two natures.¹ And Dr. Hall, with great justice, says that the Fathers

' did not separate the natures, nor did they regard our Lord's actions as proceeding exclusively from one or other nature in turn. . . . The Fathers saw rightly that the divine nature is *required* to account for some of our Lord's works, and that others *exhibited* the reality of His manhood. But they recognized the unity of His Person, and did justice to the truths that His divine works on earth were wrought in and through His manhood, and that His human life was not what it would have been had Christ been merely human ' (p. 48, *note*).

Putting aside, then, this misconception of the meaning of St. Leo and other Fathers, it may be truly said that such juxtaposition as was affirmed at Chalcedon and has been maintained in our pages, is only to be abandoned by the admission of the fundamental fault of ' kenoticism,' the assertion of a change in the divine nature at the time of the Incarnation, an assertion which is inconsistent with what has been well called ' the permanence of His Godhead in the Incarnate as involved in His undivided eternal personality.'² If our Lord is God and His divine nature is unimpaired, if He is Man and His human nature is complete, while the eternal Person acts in both natures and both natures are in the closest possible relation and communion with one another, they exist side by side. Anything unsatisfactory in the word ' juxtaposition ' is due to the imperfections of language, not to the belief of St. Leo and Chalcedon. If this belief is to be denied, and if, at the same time, the unity of our Lord's Person is to be maintained and the confusion of His two natures rejected, nothing is left open but the marring of His divine nature. So clear is it that this particular attitude towards patristic thought has the closest connexion with ' kenoticism ' in general.

We are indebted to Dr. Hall also, for the emphasis he lays on the destructive effect of ' kenotic ' theories on the doctrine of the Atonement and on the ethical value of our Lord's life. ' Our Lord's self-sacrifice '

' required our Lord's assumption of human nature and its conditions. But neither does self-sacrifice in general nor did His self-sacrifice in particular require or admit of an impoverishment of nature. When we surrender ourselves for others, we do not change our proper

¹ Bright, *Select Sermons of St. Leo the Great on the Incarnation*, pp. 231-2 (2nd edit.)

² Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 334.

nature,
adopt co
rightful
self-mut
An imp
it, signif
self-sacr
self-ruin
But its i
should b
the God
' Gen
with the
show syn
ignorant
by exer
weaknes
them as
Being b
in His c
love and

The
atones
the grea
when it
any way
knowled
divine j
embrace
their sin
saying t
when H
loved to
action, r
me and
suppose
there w
limitatio
As t
value of
divine a
be the

¹ In v
word. T
note on p
limitatio

² Gal.

nature, but merely prefer the advantage of others to our own, and adopt conditions, perhaps, which are beneath what pertains to our rightful position and dignity. The sacrifice of self does not mean self-mutilation or self-annihilation, but humiliation and self-surrender. An impoverishment of one's nature, or a kenosis of what pertains to it, signifies failure of power and forfeiture of prerogative, and robs self-sacrifice of its ethical significance and value by changing it into self-ruin. The merit of our Lord's death was due to His obedience. But its infinite value for our salvation, and the impossibility that He should be holden of it, arose from His possession of the fulness of the Godhead when he died' (pp. 55-6).

'General sympathy involves a real identification of the stronger with the weaker, but this identification needs analysis. We do not show sympathy with the weak by ceasing to be strong, or with the ignorant and foolish by ceasing to have knowledge and wisdom, but by exercising our strength and wisdom under the conditions of weakness and folly, and by such accommodation¹ and contact with them as will enable us to realize in some measure their misery. Being but men we cannot do this perfectly. . . . Our Lord possessed in His own undivided Person both the vantage ground of divine love and the means of perfect contact with our sorrows' (pp. 104-6).

The doctrine of the Atonement demands that He who atones be truly God and perfectly Man. What becomes of the great act of self-sacrifice upon the Cross if at the moment when it is offered the divine nature of Him who offers it is in any way impaired? What knowledge short of the infinite knowledge of God could realize to the full the claims of divine justice and the needs of the human race, or could embrace at one moment the consciousness of all men and all their sins? Yet Christian reverence would shrink back from saying that the Lord did not fully know what He was doing when He died upon the Cross, and Christian theology has loved to depict the sacrifice of Christ as a voluntary deliberate action, not only as chosen but also as performed. He 'loved me and gave Himself for me,' says St. Paul.² Are we to suppose that as He gave Himself at the crisis of His Passion there was something imperfect in His love because there was limitation to His knowledge?

As the doctrine of the Atonement, so also the ethical value of our Lord's life requires His possession of all His divine attributes. If His sympathy is to be perfect, it must be the sympathy of one who, while using all right human

¹ In view of recent controversies, caution is needed in the use of this word. That Dr. Hall is fully conscious of this, however, is shown by a note on pp. 105-6, in which he says: 'Accommodation is one thing, self-limitation or abandonment of knowledge is another.'

² Gal. ii. 20.

feelings, has the knowledge which is characteristic of God. It has been suggested that the power of the sympathetic mind of an intelligent and instructed man to 'look at things from the uninstructed point of view' illustrates how 'the sympathetic entrance of God into human life' 'carried with it' 'a real "forgetting."'¹ On the other hand, it has been shown that in 'the self-adaptation of a teacher to the capacities of' a 'pupil' 'the teacher retains, all along, his own superior knowledge';² and Dr. Hall has pointed out that in the work of teaching there 'is in no real sense an abandonment of knowledge, but a retracing of its elements along the lines of childish progress,' and that 'the security of this retracing depends upon the teacher retaining his superior knowledge' (p. 104 n.).

'Love is deepest when most discerning and most full of resource. An ignorant love is at best imperfect. . . . It is His strength which glorifies and gives value to His love, and which did glorify and energize it whilst He walked on earth, "mighty to save" in the midst of mortal pain. What love can equal that which moved One who was possessing infinite majesty, wisdom, power, and holiness to wear our flesh as an inglorious veil over it all, to exercise our finite faculties of power and knowledge, to breathe our sin-laden atmosphere, and to be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities" in a nature which He had united hypostatically with His own? Clearly it was His continued possession of divine prerogatives which made His obedience and submission to the conditions of the form of a servant such an amazing mystery of love' (pp. 102-3).

Dr. Hall does not give much space to the 'argument against kenoticism' derived from 'the truth of the divine immutability,' because he is of opinion that the 'kenotic' theory is sufficiently refuted without recourse to it. He has, however, no doubt that the argument itself is sound and that 'immutability of attributes is an essential truth of the divine nature.' Moreover, he points out:

'To say this is merely to say that God is eternal, and therefore can never cease to be God, and this is a revealed truth beyond all question. As has already been shown, to lose divine attributes is to cease to be God, for that is not God which does not possess the divine nature, and the divine nature is that and that only which possesses all divine attributes. Kenoticists undoubtedly sacrifice the truth of divine immutability' (pp. 233-4).

In doing so they contradict the plain teaching of Holy Scripture.

¹ Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, p. 219.

² Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 333.

So
valuab
ii. 5-1
criticis
and w
in the
in His
its lite
jected
Ottley
that no
Testar
favour

We
the int
than o

'Ou
harmon
things,
verse 4
abandon
but suc
for look
one of
others'

And, a
to say

'Th
Paul wa
The onl
metaph
by St. P
in Rom
faith is
He is sp
thing li
siveness
to bapti
the cros
lest the
somethi
"It wer
my glor
but St.

Some of our readers may remember that in Dr. Gifford's valuable work entitled *The Incarnation: a Study of Philippians* ii. 5-11, the learned author, while agreeing with most of our criticisms on Mr. Ottley's treatment of St. Paul's teaching, and while careful to restrict any abandonment by the Word in the Incarnation to the surrender of the glory of heaven in His life on earth as Man, interpreted the word *ἐκένωσε* in its literal sense as denoting such an abandonment, and objected to what we had written on that point against Mr. Ottley.¹ In our review of Dr. Gifford's book we contended that neither the use of the word *κενῶω* elsewhere in the New Testament nor the context in *Philippians* ii. 5-11 is in favour of interpreting *ἐκένωσε* in its literal sense.²

We are glad to find that on this point Dr. Hall advocates the interpretation of *Philippians* ii. 5-11 which we have more than once maintained.

'Our Lord's self-emptying,' he says, 'must be interpreted in harmony with what it is given to illustrate—not looking to one's own things, but also to the things of others. The word "also" [*i.e.* in verse 4] 'is significant. St. Paul did not set out to illustrate an *abandonment* of one's own things to make room for something else, but such a freedom from anxious care about them as would allow for looking *also* to the things of others. In short, the lesson is not one of self-robbery, but of sympathy with and care for the needs of others' (p. 58).

And, after discussing the passage in some detail, he goes on to say :

'The above considerations should be sufficient to prove that St. Paul was not asserting a literal self-emptying on our Lord's part. The only possible reply would be that the word *κενῶω* is never used metaphorically. The fact is, however, that the word is so employed by St. Paul in the four other instances in which he uses it. Thus, in *Rom. iv. 14* he writes : "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, *κεκένωται*, and the promise is made of none effect." He is speaking of the act of faith and cannot mean that it has something literally taken out of it, but that its value is reduced in impressiveness. Again, in *1 Cor. i. 17* he says : "For Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel : not in wisdom of words lest the cross of Christ should be made void, *κενωθῇ*." What is meant is lest the cross should suffer disparagement, not lest it should have something taken out of it. In the same epistle, chapter ix. 15, he says : "It were better for me rather to die than that any man should make my glorying void, *κενώσει*." Glorying cannot literally be emptied, but St. Paul feared that it might lose its justification and impressive-

¹ Gifford, *The Incarnation*, pp. 133-4.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1897, pp. 171-2.

ness. Finally, in 2 Cor. ix. 3, he writes: "But I have sent the brethren, that our glorying on your behalf may not be made void, κενώθη, in this respect"—that is, be made unjustifiable or less impressive. In all these instances the verb κενώω seems to signify the disparagement of something—not a real emptying of it.

'We conclude that the phrase *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε* is metaphorical. This is obscured by rendering it "emptied Himself," although the revisers have followed the Peshito and Vulgate in translating etymologically. We cannot use a translation, however well considered, as the final basis of exegesis. We must consider the original Greek. The difficulty here lies in the fact that the phrase "emptied Himself" does not readily suggest a metaphorical meaning to an English reader as does the phrase *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε* to a Greek reader. The two phrases are etymologically equivalent, but the idiom of the two languages is not precisely the same. We think that the phrase might be translated with substantial accuracy by the words "disparaged Himself." To disparage is to lower in rank or estimation, to make "of no reputation," as the Authorized Version renders it. Our Lord lowered the estimation in which He would otherwise have been held by veiling His majesty in the form of a servant' (pp. 65-8).

To quote Bishop Pearson:

'If any man doubt how Christ emptied Himself, the text will satisfy him, by "taking the form of a servant."'¹

Or, as it has been well expressed by Dr. Bright,

'If we take *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε* in logical connexion with what precedes and follows, we shall see that practically it means "He became inferior to the Father as touching His manhood."'²

Or, as explained with great power and earnestness by the Bishop of Oxford in a Charge the method of publication of which seems to have hindered it from receiving the attention it deserves:

'Here comes in the speculation about the limitation of our Lord's knowledge, and the interpretation of the word in the Epistle to the Philippians which in the Authorized Version is read "made Himself of no reputation," and in the Revised Version "emptied Himself." On St. Paul's use of this word, as I need not tell you, a formulated idea has been raised that threatens to affect the most essential doctrines connected with the Incarnation; and our Lord is supposed accordingly to have, in becoming man, divested Himself of certain powers which He had with the Father, of almightiness and all-knowledge, so far as the exercise of them through His human nature could, or could not, be supposed to be possible.

'That such can be the direct and proper meaning of the word "emptied Himself" in the passage cited, I cannot, notwithstanding

¹ Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, Article ii.

² Bright, *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 393.

the arm
There
and ou
parallel
scribed
as we a
self-eff
attempt
but the
for us.
'It
that thi
limitati
of some
for our
became
far it do
ought i
so little
were in
text.

'Th
terminal
through
under c
His divi
of unqu
upon th
dwell in
wisdom
with us,
pudiate
element
could n
Father
terprete
patible
and the
which i
desire i
unchang
even to
sabachth

'But
the limit
in posse
essence
explain
conceive
have po

the array of authority with which I may be pressed, at all admit. There must be a parallel between the example of our Lord's action and our duty which it is cited to illustrate. There is in fact no parallel whatever between such a *κένωσις* as that which I have described and that by which it is in our power to imitate the Lord Jesus, as we are exhorted to do upon this principle. It is self-surrender, self-effacement, and humiliation for the sake of others that we are to attempt to practise—not the limitation of our power of helping them, but the devotion of our whole self for them, as He devoted Himself for us.

'It is, to my mind, very incidentally and not at all appropriately that this expression is pressed into the service of the doctrine of limitation. It does, however, illustrate it so far as to give an instance of something which the Son of God becoming man, for us men and for our salvation, did give up; who when He was rich, for our sake became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich. And so far it does illustrate the theory of limitation, but only so far. Nor ought it ever to be used as the keyword of a theory with which it has so little to do; or as the decisive proof of a doctrine which if it were intended to be taught could not safely be left to an isolated text.

'That our blessed Lord in the Incarnation did, by His own determinate counsel, one with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit through whom He offered Himself without blemish, place Himself under conditions by which habitually He regulated the exercise of His divine power in and through His humanity, I think is a matter of unquestioned Catholic doctrine: an habitual self-restraint put upon the exercise of those powers of fulness of the Godhead which dwell in Him bodily; a restraint upon the display of the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are all in Him, hidden whilst He was with us, but never suspended or laid aside, never dissembled or repudiated, a *πλήρωμα* with which *κένωσις* has no common term or element. Whenever and wherever it is said of our Lord that He could not do this or that, or that this or that which He had with the Father was not His own to give, the expression can certainly be interpreted as meaning that such exercise of will or power was incompatible with the conditions under which He had placed Himself; and the same interpretation applies to all expressions in the Gospel which imply any change, or development of purpose, or exercise of desire in prayer on the part of Him who is, in His divine nature, unchangeable and beyond all limitation of foreknowledge of will; even to the last words of identification with us, *Eloi Eloi lama sabachthani*.

'But the limitation of knowledge is a very different thing from the limitation of the exercise of power. Power itself has its essence *in posse*, its manifestation in exercise of will; knowledge has its essence *in esse*. We cannot, in our thought, define or intelligently explain away the knowledge of the Lord Incarnate. We cannot conceive that He could have knowledge and not use it, as He could have power and not exercise it; His omniscience is of the essence

of the personality in which manhood and Godhead united in Him. . . .

'The doctrine, then, of the perfect possession but habitual restraint of His divine powers by the Son of man during the thirty years of His life on earth does not allow of any imputation of ignorance or incapacity. If such imputation be once admitted, notwithstanding all argumentative safeguards and compensating considerations, the great Gospel of Grace and Salvation is touched on its keystone, and on whomsoever it falls it shall grind him to powder. Grant it—then, could Jesus of Nazareth forget, could He mistake, could He become confused in argument, could He be inconsistent in His teaching, could He be Himself mistaken? Grant it, and what safeguard have we that He did not forget, was not mistaken or confused or inconsistent or Himself deceived? We may ask no end of such questions. If the Saviour was ignorant once, how, when or where does the limitation of His knowledge cease, and within what terms, beyond those of the self-conditioning of constant self-restraint, does it affect the region of His mediatorial work? Could our loving God—for, if all else is a mistake, there must be a true and loving God—could He treat us so?'¹

Thus, the 'kenotic' interpretation of Philippians ii. 7 is inconsistent with the context in which the verse occurs, the use of the word *κενόω* in every other place in the New Testament in which it is used, the general teaching of Holy Scripture, the traditional theology of the Christian Church, and those considerations at the very heart of religious life on which the Bishop of Oxford has laid stress. Is it too much to say that to build a theological system on an interpretation which stands thus condemned is to bid farewell to the principles of scholarship and of common sense, as well as of Catholic truth?

Dr. Hall takes pains to make clear that in asserting the continued existence of all His divine attributes in the Incarnate Word he does not mean to minimize the truth of our Lord's manhood and the reality of His human limitations. Indeed, he carries the recognition of such human limitations so far that he is constrained to dissent from the view of the knowledge of our Lord's human mind which was advocated by Dr. Liddon in the *Bampton Lectures* for 1866 (p. 22, note), and is evidently of opinion that consideration of the evidence

¹ *A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese.* By William Stubbs, D.D., Bishop of Oxford, at his second visitation, April and May 1893, pp. 17-20. This Charge contains, beside much else of very high value, an important discussion of the subject of Biblical criticism, and a statement, of remarkable ability, about our Lord's words in St. Mark xiii. 32. There was a Short Notice of it in our number for July 1893, pp. 493-5 (cf. p. 492).

afford
theory
knew
While
widely
mind,
there
to asc
mind
of God
sphere
the d
sphere

Dr
which
it to t
reader
expres
though
prevail
of the
help t
extrac
enrich
from c
opposi
a pass
that w

Dr
the ke

' 1.
the cor
with it.

' 2.
Ecume

' 3.

' 4.

' 5.
our rel

' In
is rath

' It
writes
note co
been m

VOL

afforded by the New Testament requires the rejection of the theory that during His ministry our Lord in His human mind knew all things which a human mind is capable of receiving. While we doubt whether he is not disposed to extend too widely the nescience which he ascribes to our Lord's human mind, it is to be recognized that this is a matter upon which there may well be some difference of opinion. It is one thing to ascribe nescience on some points to our Lord's human mind while affirming the retention of the infinite knowledge of God by His divine Person within as well as without the sphere of the Incarnation; it is entirely different to deny that the divine Person of the Son of God abandoned in any sphere of being His divine knowledge on becoming Incarnate.

Dr. Hall's book contains much which is valuable on points which we have not touched in this article. We can commend it to the clergy and to students of theology and to general readers as containing a powerful argument very clearly expressed, and as bearing marks of much careful study and thought. We hope it may do something to stop the growing prevalence of 'kenotic' views which imperil alike the doctrine of the Incarnation and the doctrine of God. An important help towards the performance of this work is in the valuable extracts from private letters from Dr. Bright with which it is enriched. Incidentally it has been gratifying to us to learn from one of these (p. 30) that the interpretation which, in opposition to Canon Gore, we attached in a former article to a passage in Dr. Bright's *Waymarks in Church History* is that which was intended by the author.¹

Dr. Hall summarizes as follows his 'reasons for rejecting the kenotic theory':

'1. The Scriptures do not justify the kenotic theory, but on the contrary contain truths and statements which are inconsistent with it.

'2. The theory is inconsistent with the dogmatic decrees of the Ecumenical Councils touching the Incarnation and our Lord's Person.

'3. It is rejected by Catholic doctors in general of every age.

'4. The arguments by which it is supported are fallacious.

'5. It is inconsistent with more than one fundamental truth of our religion, and tends inevitably to Socinianism' (p. 76).

In the first instance the direction of the 'kenotic' theory is rather towards denying the true idea of God than towards

¹ It is stated in a note on p. 30: 'Dr. Bright in a personal letter writes "In the *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1896, p. 309, is a note correctly interpreting some words of mine which appear to have been misunderstood."

Socinianism. In all else, Dr. Hall supplies amply sufficient proof to substantiate the statements which he thus has made. And, in this one point, while for a time the divine nature of Christ may be declared to exist and to be personally united to His human nature though having surrendered divine attributes, yet, when the true idea of the immutability of God reasserts itself, those who have accepted the misconceptions of 'kenoticism' will be left with the alternative of abandoning their theory or sinking to regard our Lord as merely man. One or two generations of thinkers may retain belief in His Godhead on a basis of 'kenoticism'; it is their pupils for whom the gravest anxiety must be felt.

ART. IV.—DR. DALE OF BIRMINGHAM.

The Life of R. W. Dale, of Birmingham. By his Son,
A. W. W. DALE. With Portrait. (London, 1898.)

'STRENUOUS'¹ is the word in which we should sum up our impression of Dr. Dale, the great Nonconformist leader, whose biography has been worthily written by his son. Mr. Dale quotes (p. iv) Cicero's remark, 'filio satis amplum patrimonium memoriam mei nominis relinquo,' and his filial piety has shielded him from 'the sin of Ham,' which he says 'lies as an open pit in the way of any son who writes his father's life' (p. v). There is no indiscreet revelation here of the sanctities of private life, and indeed indiscretion could find little to reveal in the life of a man who kept no diaries, and whose 'inner life . . . he kept to himself,' and who 'lived before the world or alone, and whose wife passed away before she was able to give the biographer' the help that she alone could give. Except for extracts from private letters, and one or two fleeting glimpses of his home,² it is his father's public life which Mr. Dale describes, strenuous in all that he was and

¹ We should like in self-defence, and also as showing the justice of the epithet, to say that this word occurred to us after reading the book, before we saw (in an advertisement) that it had been employed by a brother reviewer in the *Daily News*. It is twice at least used by his son, pp. 44, 511; compare p. 265.

² Among these are the few words on his married life (pp. 98-9), the death of one of his children (p. 208), the books near his bed (p. 44), and a few more details in a chapter on the discipline of sorrow (p. 508), and in the last part of his life.

said a
habits
politic
insiste
life as
ness a
mirati
head a
in the
hesita
more
Engla
genera
of such
did no
nigh e
the in
part o
vent s
making
divides
(1829-
colleg
junior
ministe
matter
his fath
dents
early
public
Dale's
of Mr.
Educat
Dale is
charact

¹ 'D
once sai
² In
preacher
England
³ Fo
John Cl
'the ide
power a
fundame
he believ
his appli

said and wrote and did,¹ in his character, his work, his habits, his oratory, his literary style, his religious and political views, the tenacity of all his convictions, the clear insistence on definite doctrinal truth, the robust vigour of his life as a citizen. It was this great characteristic of earnestness and thoroughness which not only called forth the admiration of his fellow-citizens for him as a man who was head and shoulders above anyone else on the Christian side in the public life of Birmingham, but also we have no hesitation in saying caused him to be better understood and more deeply respected by the best part of the Church of England than any other Nonconformist minister of his generation.² No doubt it was difficult to compress the life of such a man into one volume, but we regret that Mr. Dale did not curtail still further the narrative of this book of well-nigh eight hundred pages, for the sake of all readers except the inner company of Dr. Dale's admirers. It is no small part of our regret that the diffuseness of the work may prevent some who do not already know what Dr. Dale was from making acquaintance with his fine character.³ Mr. Dale divides the biography into four parts or books. The first (1829-1859) covers his father's childhood, his school and college days, and ends with his six years of work as the junior colleague of Mr. James, the interesting and friendly minister of Carr's Lane, Birmingham. The most noticeable matters in this early part of Dr. Dale's life are the fact that his father was a native of Essex, a stronghold of the independents alike in Cromwellian and in modern times, and the early evidence which the young man gave of power as a public speaker. The second part (1859-1872) opens with Dale's position as sole pastor at Carr's Lane, after the death of Mr. James, and ends with the important matter of the Education Bill of 1870. In the course of this period Mr. Dale is led to describe in outline many of the remarkable characteristics of the town of Birmingham as it was hurrying

¹ 'Dale drives in his nails so hard that he splits the wood,' a friend once said (p. 153).

² In saying this we do not forget Mr. Spurgeon's unique position as a preacher, nor the ready welcome which was extended by Church of England scholars to Dr. Reynolds's little volume on St. Athanasius.

³ For a short and admirable eulogy of Dr. Dale, we may refer to Dr. John Clifford's *Typical Christian Leaders*, pp. 129-150. He calls Dale 'the ideal chief of our modern Nonconformity,' and comments upon his power as a preacher, his 'vision of Christ,' his strong adherence to the fundamental facts and abiding truths of the Gospel, his devotion to what he believed to be the New Testament ideal of the Christian Society, and his application of Christian principles to social and political life.

forward to its present position of civic importance,¹ and side by side with that, and often at the head of it, is the story of his father's rise in the theological and literary world, in the counsels of the Congregational Union, in political and public work, and notably in educational affairs. The third part (1873-1886) of Dr. Dale's life includes the publication of the great course of lectures on the Atonement, the work by which its author is best known by members of the Church of England, and which stands with the books on *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, and *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*,² as the most valuable production of Dr. Dale's mind and the best expression of his fundamental theological position.³ There follows a further statement of his principles, his relation to the Church of England, his municipal energy, his attitude towards the new political situation which arose out of Irish affairs, and his threefold educational work in connexion with the Birmingham School Board, the Grammar School, and the Congregational settlement of Mansfield College in the city of Oxford on a footing towards the University which is similar to that of Wycliffe Hall. The last part (1886-1895) is noticeable for the restrained narrative of Dr. Dale's illness and decease, for the estimate of his position as a theologian by Principal Fairbairn, and the chapter of reminiscences by Dr. J. G. Rogers. An Appendix contains a list of all Dr. Dale's most important literary work, so far as it can be traced, and a carefully constructed index includes references to all the chief incidents of his life, arranged in conveniently short periods. The brief sketch which we have given of the biography will indicate what the topics are which call for special attention. They naturally fall under such headings as Personal History and Character, Congregational Principles, Educational Policy, and Dogmatic Teaching. The contents of the book could be for the most part arranged under one or another of these heads, and on each of them we will make such observations as the biography has suggested to us. We trust that we shall show what respect we feel for Dr. Dale, and also what excellent reasons there are for reading the story of his life.

The bare facts of Dr. Dale's life are not striking; and when we have said that he lived and worked and died at

¹ Not so very long ago it was 'a great village' (p. 136). Who collects now that Birmingham is on the river Rea?

² See Dean Church's letter on this book, p. 599.

³ The *Yale Lectures on Preaching* reveal more of the writer himself than any other of his books, and deserve to be read on this account as well as because they were cordially praised for their value to the student of the science of preaching by Dr. Liddon (p. 339).

Birm
wish
that
born
after
was a
It w
Univ
sible
Mr.
minis
the c
what
thirty
which
by so
told
why t
nation
than
Roge
747-9
assist
which
of En
biograp
reman
convic
oppos
as the
many
and th
Dr. L
cott, v
in the
the sa
Dale a
(p. 55)
regard
Abbey
dence
of tho
piety v
For ex
Tracta

Birmingham we have said all, and said it too as he would have wished it to be said. It is only for the sake of completeness that we expand this short statement, and add that he was born in London in 1829, that he went to several schools, and, after taking part as a lad in public prayers and preaching, was admitted at Spring Hill Congregational College in 1847. It was natural that his various successes in the London University examinations should lead to the offer of a responsible post, and in 1854 he took his place at Carr's Lane as Mr. James's co-pastor. On the death of that venerable minister in 1859 he became sole pastor, and he presided over the congregation there until his death in 1895. It is by what he was, by the work which he did in the course of those thirty-six years, that he gained the high position of respect in which he is held by Birmingham, by his own denomination, and by so many of his countrymen. Birmingham 'loved him and told him so' (see p. 572, and compare pp. 693-4). To learn why they loved him, and why the members of his own denomination gave him reverence as they did, we cannot do better than read the attempt, too long for quotation, which Dr. Rogers makes to describe the character of his friend (pp. 747-9), or, again, the affectionate reminiscences of his assistant, the Rev. G. Barber (pp. 638-45). The regard which was paid to him by well-known members of the Church of England is shown by numerous extracts from letters in the biography. This correspondence bears out the truth of a remark of Dr. Rogers that 'it is the men of strong and deep convictions who are most able to respect those who hold opposite views as firmly, as intelligently, and as tenaciously as they cling to their own' (p. 739). This is illustrated by many passages in the letters which passed between Dr. Dale and the present Dean of Salisbury, Dr. Bright, Dean Church, Dr. Liddon, Dean Paget, Bishop Thorold, and Bishop Westcott, which can easily be traced under these respective names in the index. Many details of personal intercourse display the same spirit of mutual esteem; for example, between Dr. Dale and his doughty educational antagonist, Dean Gregory (p. 550); and to these must be added many expressions of regard, such as the sermon of Canon Gore at Westminster Abbey after Dr. Dale's death (p. 693), and the frequent evidence given in the book that Dr. Dale understood the position of those from whom he differed, and appreciated forms of piety which were cast in a very different mould from his own. For example, he was intimate with Dr. Oldknow, the learned Tractarian vicar of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, and says: 'I

had a great respect for him, and we often discussed, in the friendliest spirit, the ecclesiastical differences by which we were so widely separated' (p. 214). That is to say, 'the basis of intimacy was not suppression of opinion, but free and frank discussion' (*ibid.*). Again, in a letter to Mr. Gladstone he says: 'I am a Puritan, but understand what Easter is to a Churchman, and trust it has come to you with great joy and glory' (p. 457).¹ On another occasion he writes of Father Benson's *Manual of Intercessory Prayer*:

'I have found it helpful for devotional purposes in solitary prayer—very helpful. But it may also be of use in suggesting topics for prayer in public. . . . These High Churchmen, with the use they make of the liturgical and devotional literature of many centuries, have much to teach us. Of course you will find some things in the book which you will not approve; but I shall be surprised if you do not find it very helpful.'²

At another time he put some sermons by Dean Church and Dean Paget into his young friend's hands, saying, 'Read them, read them over and over again, and you will see the kind of sermons I like.' He also often read and recommended Newman's sermons (p. 642). He was also whole-somely perplexed by Dean Stanley's 'colour-blindness in the domain of theology, by his absolute incapacity, as it seemed, to apprehend the most striking distinctions and shades of religious truth' (p. 215). When the editor of the *Guardian* asked Dr. Dale, as a representative Nonconformist, to pass an opinion on Canon Fremantle's deservedly forgotten scheme of Church nationalization, he wrote a letter which should have opened the eyes both of the author of the scheme and of those who put their trust in the conferment of statutory powers on parochial councils of Churchmen (p. 393). Nor was he able to agree with the estimate which the *British Quarterly* formed of Dr. Farrar's eloquence, as he told his friend Dr. Reynolds (p. 327).³ When he had read the early volumes of Pusey's *Life* he said earnestly to Dr. Fairbairn:

¹ From the time at which *The Living Christ* was written an Easter hymn was sung in Carr's Lane every Sunday morning (p. 643). This was in harmony with Keble's thought, 'An Easter Day in every week.' For Dr. Dale's knowledge of *The Christian Year* see p. 515. To Dr. Bright he says: 'I never go into the pulpit on Easter morning without being thrilled by the remembrance that all Western Christendom is exulting and triumphing in the Resurrection of our Lord' (p. 329).

² Letter to his assistant, the Rev. G. Barber, p. 635.

³ The letter is quoted also in *The Life and Letters of Dr. Reynolds* (Hodder and Stoughton), p. 271. For other allusions to Dr. Dale in that book see pp. 150, 495-6.

'The blessing of God was in it [the Tractarian Movement], though we did not see it, and in a form they did not understand; in the lives and in the devotion of these men a new endowment of the Holy Spirit came into the life of England' (p. 699). And again, in a letter,

'What a man that was! . . . I closed the book with a deep impression of the nobleness and massiveness of his nature, and feeling more than ever that the power of God was in him. The absence of joy¹ in his religious life was only the inevitable effect of his conception of God's method of saving men; in parting with the Lutheran truth concerning justification he parted with the springs of gladness' (p. 666).

The import of these quotations may naturally lead to the inquiry how far Dr. Dale was a typical Congregationalist,² and that question will be answered by glancing at the chief allusions to distinctive Congregationalist principles in the volume.

Both early and late in life, as it seems almost superfluous to observe, Dr. Dale entirely accepted the cardinal principles of Congregationalism: that two or three men professedly gathered together in the name of Christ, and so in accordance with Christ's promise having Christ in the midst of them,³ constitute 'a Church'; that each member of such congregation has the same rights and privileges as any other; that each congregation is independent⁴ of any other, being solely responsible to and governed by the Lord Christ, and that there is no such thing according to Christian principles of organization and government as a provincial or national Church, or any order of ministers discharging any functions which are not within the full power of any member of the congregation. We may give one or two references to exhibit the accuracy

¹ We know how much ground there is, especially in the later volumes and in such a sad resolve as 'Never to smile except with children,' for this impression of Dr. Pusey. But Dr. Liddon once told a beautiful story of Dr. Pusey which clearly showed what deep experiences he had of religious joy. See Liddon, *Passion-tide Sermons*, p. 271.

² He offended some older people by smoking, by his beard, by ordinary lay attire (p. 203).

³ The matter in dispute between the Church of England and the Congregationalists lies in the answer to the question 'What does Christ, when thus "in the midst" of His servants, command as essential parts of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God?'

⁴ The difference between the early Independents and the modern Congregationalists is chiefly to be sought in the increasing desire for more intercourse between various congregations, such as is indicated by the formation of the Congregational Union. See also *The Denominational Reason Why*, pp. 253-60.

of this summary. The service of 'ordination,' 'though usual, is not held to be essential, either to the validity of the pastorate or to the efficacy of the sacraments which the pastor administers.¹ Ministerial authority . . . is derived from the calling of the Holy Spirit, and from the invitation of the Church that thus chooses a teacher and guide. But . . . the service confers on the minister no authority that he does not already possess' (p. 94). Dr. Dale's early adhesion to these principles will be found in long extracts on pages 102-4; the chapter on 'Congregational Principles' (p. 341) records the convictions of his mature life, and these remained with him to the end (cf. p. 242). The *Manual of Congregation Principles*, which Dr. Dale published in 1884, contains four parts, the first on Congregational Polity, the second on Church Officers, the third on the Sacraments, and the fourth on some practical aspects of Congregationalism. The third part did not apparently find acceptance among the denomination as a whole. The Committee of the Union confined the portion of the work which they set for their religious examination to the first two parts, and Mr. Dale says that his father probably stood almost alone among Congregationalists in his conception of the nature and office of the Lord's Supper (p. 355), though Dr. Dale himself expressly repudiated any belief in a 'Real Presence' in the Sacramental elements, and claimed to hold the theory of the older Congregationalists (p. 356).² Mr. Dale's lucid attempt to explain his father's exact position in relation to Sacramental truth is very interesting (p. 358). It is to be noticed that, holding what is for a Nonconformist high Sacramental doctrine, he did not at all exclude from Church membership those who denied the permanent obligation of the Lord's Supper (p. 363), and he even allows the theoretical possibility of 'a Church' with a pastor who could not conscientiously take part in the rite, though he would hesitate to elect such a man (pp. 363-6). We venture to think that Mr. Dale has only expressed half a truth by saying (p. 366) that by the lectures on the Atonement his father 'had joined hands with Evangelical Church-

¹ Compare *The Autobiography of Newman Hall*, p. 62.

² In a visit to Australia 'wherever he went he preached Congregationalism, not the bastard Congregationalism that regards itself as a democratic form of Church polity, and teaches the people that they have a right to govern the Church as they please, but the Congregationalism of the heroic age which makes the people responsible for finding the mind of Christ as to the way in which His Church should be governed' (p. 564). He was alive to the danger of 'excessive individualism,' which besets modern Congregationalism (p. 243).

men,
a stron
of the
exami
lecture
ing un
warmer
would
gotten,
doctrin
the fac
value in
found n
the sha
in the r
the inte
perhaps
roughly
duty of
lowest
special
aristocr
certainly
There is
not chie
who are
house to
see glin
humour
the evid
long con
who has
it in the
in the p
this was
of pastor
work (p.
that past

¹ The
book in hi
self refers
Canon) G
of Theolog
be (and we
quoted wit
P. 173, 2nd

men,' while it was his Sacramental teaching which 'gave him a strong hold upon the sympathies of a considerable section of the High Church party.' If Mr. Dale will carefully examine the testimony of Churchmen to the value of the lectures on the Atonement, he will find, unless we are labouring under a very erroneous impression, that many of the warmest tributes to their worth proceed from those who would be called High Churchmen.¹ It must never be forgotten, though some random and popular essays on the doctrine of the Atonement may from time to time obscure the fact, that the Atonement is invested with an infinite value in the eyes of those who believe first of all in the profound mystery of the Incarnation, and then in the reality of the share which the Eucharist gives to all faithful worshippers in the merits of Christ's sacrifice. The prominence given to the intellect by an eminent Congregationalist from America, perhaps by American Congregationalism as a whole, thoroughly commended itself to Dr. Dale. He regarded the duty of endeavouring to reach the most ignorant and the lowest as imperative upon all Christians, but he held that the special mission of Congregationalism to a kind of intellectual aristocracy was an old Congregational tradition, and it was certainly in accord with his own personal gifts (pp. 612-13). There is much in the work of pastoral visitation which does not chiefly call for the exercise of the intellect, and the clergy who are accustomed to go from street to street and from house to house on nearly every afternoon of their lives will see glimpses of quite another world in Dr. Dale's good-humoured chaff with his friend Dr. Rogers on the subject, in the evidently sincere confession of Dr. Rogers that 'I have long come to feel that the work is impossible for any man who has to fill a pulpit in London, with all that gathers round it in the way of public duty,' and in Mr. Binney's appearance in the pulpit on Sunday morning without a sermon—surely this was 'temper'—because, having been criticised for lack of pastoral visitation, he had devoted an entire week to the work (p. 744). There is no recognition of the familiar truth that pastoral visits supply subjects and questions, and study

¹ The present Bishop of Lincoln used warmly to recommend the book in his lectures when he was a professor at Oxford; Mr. Dale himself refers to Canon Liddon (p. 325); the work is included by Mr. (now Canon) Gore in the list of choice books given in his *Hints for the Study of Theology with a View to Holy Orders* (Skeffington, 1886); it used to be (and we hope still is) recommended at Cuddesdon, and is frequently quoted with strong approval in such books as Dr. Bright's *St. Leo* (e.g. p. 173, 2nd ed.).

the treatment of them and the right answers. But Dr. Dale's views as to capacity for ministerial service were broad (p. 240), and he had his own independent way of knowing the members of his congregation (p. 509).

Before leaving the subject of Congregational principles, we may say a few words on Dr. Dale's political and municipal activity, which he certainly regarded as the outcome of his religious principles. He took part in politics to an extent which (happily, we think) is not common among the clergy of the English Church, and his influence was felt and his opinion valued in very high quarters.¹ He always recognized the responsibilities of Christian citizenship, and two chapters of the book (pp. 249, 398) contain many instances of his efforts to discharge civic duties. The chapter on Church and State (p. 368) shows how vigorously his principles led him to strive for the disestablishment of the Church. Into the question of Irish politics we do not feel called upon to enter (p. 448), though that matter led Dr. Dale to withdraw from the meetings of the Congregational Union (p. 584). His educational policy, however, demands the closest study on the part of all who believe that we are only at the beginning of the settlement of the problem of elementary education. The problem broadly stated is to provide elementary education for that part of the nation that needs it, with effective public control of public money, and at the same time with an equal distribution of the financial pressure upon all, and a scheme which will give religious freedom and justice to all, whatever their religious convictions may be.² To the part of the biography which deals with this subject we will now turn, and by reason of its importance we must leave out two other branches of Dr. Dale's educational work, as a governor of the schools on the foundation of King Edward VI., and as chairman of the Spring Hill College, afterwards removed to Oxford as Mansfield College (p. 475). In the first of these Dr. Dale was specially and exceptionally honoured by the governors for his work (p. 492), and the narrative of the second contains important quotations from the original trust deed and official documents of Mansfield College concerning the declaration of faith required from various persons connected with it (p. 498).

When Dr. Dale's public life began Congregationalists were

¹ Mr. Newman Hall reports that Mr. Gladstone said that he was 'very desirous' about Dr. Dale's agreement with him on Irish affairs (*Autobiography*, p. 283).

² Even Churchmen have a right to justice.

in the
their ow
Dr. Da
of a na
public f
free edu
Forster
the scho
nominat
of the
would b
point wa
instructi
care of
(p. 289,
of the B
that he
Bible th
He did
tional t
that the
establish
instructi
teachers
go very
The mos
called '
that rem
which sa
the worl
not see l
Church
a word r
Dr. Dale
to comp
'freedom
the truth
voluntary
subscript
which D
sion (p. 5
described
comment
Our

in the main hostile to any State intervention in education, and their own schools repudiated both State aid and State control. Dr. Dale himself, however, soon asserted the necessity of a national system using compulsion and paid for with public funds. He had not in 1869 seen his way to support free education (p. 273). In 1870 he vigorously opposed Mr. Forster's famous Bill, as a Nonconformist who believed that the schools established under the Act would be purely denominational institutions in many cases, that the protection of the conscience clause was inadequate, and that grants would be made to sectarian schools (pp. 274-5). His great point was, that in any system of national education secular instruction alone should be provided by the State, and the care of religious instruction left to parents and Churches (p. 289, and compare p. 558). This was his policy as a member of the Birmingham School Board (p. 475). It must be added that he always regarded with distrust any explanation of the Bible that could be described as undogmatic (pp. 478, 556-7). He did not hesitate to say, 'I strongly dislike undenominational teaching' (p. 579). It is also important to observe that the efforts of the Religious Education Society, which was established by Dr. Dale and his friends to give religious instruction in Board Schools by the agency of voluntary teachers, did not satisfy many of its warmest supporters, nor go very far towards the solution of a very difficult problem. The most serious objection to this divorce between what is called 'secular' and 'religious' instruction is indicated in that remarkable passage in Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian* which says that the Donatists were content to leave one of the world's three measures of meal unleavened.¹ We may not see how the problem is to be satisfactorily solved, but the Church of England will never admit that it is insoluble. Just a word must be added on the financial side of the question. Dr. Dale's early experiences of the voluntary system led him to complain that many people interpreted Voluntaryism as 'freedom to give nothing' (p. 270). Many clergymen know the truth of that complaint in their efforts to maintain a voluntary school well-nigh without the aid of any voluntary subscriptions, except from their own pockets. The work which Dr. Dale did as a member of the Education Commission (p. 547) was in harmony with the position which we have described, and does not present any new points for further comment.

Our concluding head refers to Dr. Dale's dogmatic

¹ Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 529.

teaching. No doubt on this matter the reader will peruse Dr. Fairbairn's somewhat too elaborate chapter on 'Dale as a Theologian' (p. 695). But we can add one or two comments with a few extracts which will express all that we wish to say upon the subject. He spoke of his book on the Atonement as the restatement of what he felt 'to be, next to the Incarnation, the most vital doctrine of the Christian Faith' (p. 327). He was so impressed with the solemnity of dogmatic teaching that he could say, 'to touch any of the central doctrines of the Christian Faith is to incur the gravest responsibility' (pp. 328-9). He did not hold the central verities of the Incarnation and Atonement without the crowning doctrines of the Resurrection and the Ascension, and 'the living Christ' was one of his great themes (p. 593), together with a doctrine of Sacramental Grace, to which we have already alluded. We shall conclude our review of this sturdy Nonconformist, who honestly held a different judgment from the Church of England 'on some subjects which are of grave importance' (p. 661), by quoting a very eloquent passage from his works, which led the late Bishop Thorold of Winchester to say, 'I doubt if there is another man living who could have written [it]—not many dead.'¹ It is Dr. Dale's answer to the question, 'For whom does the word "God" stand?'

'It stands for One of whose greatness it seems presumptuous to speak, and in whose presence silence seems the truest worship. He lives from eternity to eternity. He is here, He is everywhere; there is no remotest region where He is not. To say that He created all things, and that, after sustaining all things through countless ages, He fainteth not, neither is He weary, is to say nothing concerning His infinite strength: He Himself is infinitely greater than the universe, and He lives, has ever lived, and will live for ever, in the power of His own life. We say, and yet we know not what we are saying, that all things in this world and in all worlds are present in His mind; in this world every grain of sand on the desolate shores of unknown seas, every ripple that breaks the surface of quiet inland streams, every wave that foams in mid-ocean, the flutter of every leaf in a thousand forests, the birth and the death of every wild flower, every drop of dew that glitters in the morning sun, the song of every bird, the joy and the pain of every living thing, every word that is spoken, every deed that is done by all the millions of the human race, every settled purpose, every transient thought, every vague longing, every passion, every memory, every hope of every man in all countries and in all times. We say that all things are present in His mind, all things in the heavens above as well as on the earth beneath;

¹ But perhaps the Bishop had not read a similar passage on 'This Being of beings' in Liddon's *Advent Sermons* (i. 288-9), or the concluding part of Bishop Ullathorne's *The Endowments of Man*, p. 401.

and then
infinite
races of
other fo
possibili
shadows
present

'He
fluctuat
clouded,
universe
assailed
not the
the law
Him it
can app
great, an

AR

The Ka
Arm
with
C. C
Coll

IN this
been ex
measur
once giv
old Arm
enough
knowled
He has
valuable
the ritu
diverge
true to
adverse
student
seems to
much d

¹ Ado
Unitarian
that He v

and then, if the countless worlds which relieve the solitudes of the infinite realms of space are filled, as well they may be, with countless races of living creatures having other joys and sorrows than ours, other forms of intellectual faculty, other temptations to sin, other possibilities of virtue, their innumerable and various lives, with all the shadows that darken and all the lights that brighten them, are always present to Him.

'He Himself is removed by an infinite distance from all the fluctuations and vicissitudes of created life. His blessedness is unclouded, His peace unbroken by the storms that beat upon the universe, which is infinitely beneath Him. His righteousness can be assailed by no temptations. The Law of Righteousness itself, though not the creature of His will, is not above Him. In His supremacy the law is supreme; He does not obey it. In Him and through Him it exerts its august authority. He dwells in light that no man can approach unto. Clouds and darkness are round Him. God is great, and we know Him not' (pp. 684-5).

ART. V.—MR. F. C. CONYBEARE ON THE PAULICIANS.

The Key of Truth. A Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia. The Armenian Text edited and translated, with illustrative Documents and Introduction, by FRED. C. CONYBEARE, M.A., formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford. (Oxford, 1898.)

IN this history of the Paulicians Mr. F. C. Conybeare has been extremely bold, and the measure of his boldness is the measure of his failure. It is only just that we should at once give our reason for this statement. In discovering the old Armenian book called *The Key of Truth*, he was fortunate enough to light upon a book which greatly enlarges our knowledge of a half-forgotten but once important heresy. He has now published this book, and together with it some valuable excerpts from ancient Armenian writers, and also the ritual of the Albigeois or Cathars. If in so doing he had diverged neither to the right nor to the left, and had been true to the principles which he has stated in his Preface, any adverse criticism would have been impossible, and every student of Church history would have been grateful. But he seems to have been unable to resist temptation. He is so much delighted with the Unitarian Adoptionism¹ which he

¹ Adoptionism may be kept as a convenient title for any form of Unitarianism which denies that Jesus was God Incarnate and asserts that He was first made a partaker of the divine nature at His baptism.

has found in *The Key of Truth* that his account of the primitive history of the Church is, as we shall demonstrate, nothing less than a perversion of history in the interests of Unitarianism.

'It has been,' he says in his Preface (p. xi), 'no part of my task to appraise the truth or falsehood of various forms of Christian opinion, but merely to exhibit them in their mutual relations; and, treating my subject as a scientific botanist treats his *flora*, to show how an original genus is evolved, in the process of adaptation to different circumstances, into different species.¹ It rests with the authoritative teacher of any sect to determine, like a good gardener, which species he will sow in his particular plot. The aim of the scientific historian of opinion is only to be accurate and impartial; and this I have tried to be, moving among warring opinions *sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo*.'

It would require a volume to show in detail what Mr. Conybeare regards as botanical impartiality, and we shall be compelled to content ourselves with exposing, in the course of this article, a few of his leading lines of argument. In the meantime we may say that the volume before us is intended to justify the following theory: *The Key of Truth*, a sacred book of the Thonraki, an Adoptionist sect of Thonrak, agrees with the information which we possess concerning the ancient Paulicians of Armenia; the organizer of the Thonraki was Smbat Bagratuni, a minister of the Persian King Chosrow, c. A.D. 600; the Thonraki merely preserved the primitive religion of Armenia,² introduced into that country from Syria, the present Armenian Church being a corrupt, 'Grecized,' and more modern form of Christianity; the Paulicians, as correctly stated by an ancient orthodox Armenian, 'got their poison from Paul of Samosata,' called by Mr. Conybeare 'the last great champion of Adoptionist Christianity in the Greek world';³ the Adoptionist Unitarianism of the Thonraki is in agreement with the doctrine of Paul of Samosata and the primitive Christianity of Syria; this primitive faith was carried by the Armenians throughout the ranges of the Taurus and from thence to Thrace; it also appeared among the Cathars of Germany and the Albigeois of France, and finally emerged in the teaching of the Anabaptists and Uni-

¹ Mr. Conybeare calls Catholic Christians 'those who deified Jesus' (pp. xxxv, xlvi). He therefore starts out with the assumption that Unitarianism is the 'original genus' of Christianity.

² E.g. on p. cx Adoptionism is called 'this earliest form of the Armenian Church.'

³ *Key*, p. cv. He also appears to have been the first. We know of no important Adoptionist before him.

tarians
matter
old Ado
thus be
credita

We
entirely
it is not
self. T
modern
caution,
saying t
ever, dis
a remna
and of I
gives fro
It simpl
Unitaria
of Sam
similarit
that the
Mr. Con
Europe,
Gascony
to assure
the Rhin
to the we
On the
Cathars
Adoption
parallel v
it, 'prob
if the C
descenda
should ex
Paulician
our great
no Adop
say is th
Adoption
a surviva
'As the

¹ *Key*,
that the C
tionist faith

Unitarians of the sixteenth century (pp. cli, cxcvi). The whole matter is summed up in the Index: 'Unitarians, a survival of old Adoptionist Church' (p. 201). Modern Unitarianism has thus been furnished with a genealogy which, if not always creditable, is throughout romantic.

We are inclined to believe that the genealogical tree is not entirely fictitious. But part of it is very doubtful, even where it is not false: and Mr. Conybeare frequently contradicts himself. Thus in one place (p. cl) he states the idea that the modern Unitarians are an old survival with a commendable caution, and immediately stultifies this cautious statement by saying that 'the early writings of the Unitarian Baptists, however, display a clear recognition on their part that they were a remnant of the Adoptionist Church of Paul of Samosata and of Photinus' (p. cli). But the long quotation which he gives from Benedict Wiszowaty displays no such recognition. It simply enumerates various names and nicknames of the Unitarians, and among them that of 'Samosatenes, from Paul of Samosata.' Wiszowaty only shows that there was a similarity of opinion between Paul and the Unitarians, not that the Unitarians were a remnant of Paul's sect. Again, Mr. Conybeare says that Adoptionism 'lurked all over Europe, but especially in the Balkans, in Lombardy, in Gascony, and along the Rhine' (p. cxcvi). But he is anxious to assure us that 'it is not possible to regard the Catharism of the Rhineland in the early middle ages as a transplantation to the west of the Paulician Church of Asia Minor' (p. cxlvii). On the contrary, he thinks that the Albigensians and the Cathars furnish an independent witness to the antiquity of Adoptionism, being the survival of a very early Christianity, parallel with Paulicianism, and having a common source with it, 'probably not later than the second century.' But surely, if the Cathars and the Paulicians were both the spiritual descendants of the Adoptionists of the second century, we should expect to find some proof that the Cathars, like the Paulicians, were Adoptionists. Yet the Lyon ritual, which is our great authority for the doctrine of the Cathars, contains no Adoptionism at all, and the most that Mr. Conybeare can say is that the users of the Lyon book were 'probably' ¹ Adoptionist. And after he has asserted that the Cathars are a survival from a most primitive age, he modifies his assertion. 'As the Paulicians of Philippopolis retained their own Church

¹ *Key*, p. cxlviii. Yet in the Preface, p. x, Mr. Conybeare assumes that the Cathars were Adoptionist, and rouses sympathy for 'the Adoptionist faith' by describing the persecution of the Cathars.

as late as the eighteenth century, so it is likely that they carried their rites and beliefs into Poland and Bohemia, and even as far as the Rhinelands.¹ He therefore prefers to think that after the Crusades there was some intercourse between the Cathars and the Paulicians of the Balkans. The whole subject of the intercourse between the Paulicians and Western Europe is involved in profound uncertainty, and we cannot say that Mr. Conybeare has made it much clearer.

Still more unsatisfactory is his attempt to show that Adoptionism was the primitive faith of the Armenian Christians. With regard to Smbat himself Mr. Conybeare has done some careful work in his endeavour to extricate the personality of the heresiarch from the conflicting statements of Armenian writers, who seem to have been led astray by the fact that there were several eminent Armenians of the name of Smbat. We confess that we are not wholly convinced that Gregory Magistros is wrong in placing Smbat the heresiarch about A.D. 850, but we will provisionally accept the date suggested by Mr. Conybeare—namely, A.D. 600. This date, then, is the *terminus ad quem* of the alleged early Armenian Adoptionism. The *terminus a quo* seems to be found in the *Acts of Archelaus*, an Adoptionist document written about A.D. 300. In these Acts, Archelaus, a Syriac-speaking bishop of Karkhar in Mesopotamian Armenia, upholds an Adoptionist Christology in opposition to the Docetic views of Mani. Now we have no difficulty whatever in believing that the principles which had been advocated so vigorously at Antioch in the latter part of the third century had spread among the Syrian clergy. No one denies that the *Pauliani*² were a sect which the Church had to reckon with at that period. Nor do we suppose that anyone denies that in Mesopotamia Paulicianism was a real power at a later period, especially among the Syrian population. What we seek is some clear proof that before the time of Smbat the Armenian-speaking Christians regarded Adoptionism as the orthodox faith, or even as one legitimate form of the orthodox faith. We have found no such proof either in Mr. Conybeare's book or anywhere else.

St. Gregory the Illuminator, whom the orthodox Armenians regarded as the pillar of their Church, seems to

¹ *Key*, p. cl. On p. civ Mr. Conybeare stated in the plainest way that the Paulicians *did* spread their tenets 'into Bohemia, Poland, Germany, Italy, France, and even into our own England,' and so prepared the ground for 'the Puritan Reformation.'

² Mr. Conybeare shows that *Pauliciani* is from an Armenian diminutive meaning 'wretched little Paul' (*Key*, p. cv).

have l
that h
in its p
which
ing ha
and th
which
this ins
it is a
Conyb
a 'vari
to inco
contrad
given u
about
menian
of Arm
prove c
the lar
various
baptism
letter t
doctrin
Adopti
to Aria
Armen
Arians.
proxim
adds t
Armen
(p. 184
gregati
Wit
states t
of the
Mesrop
that the
which c
writers

¹ *Key*
assertion
The Pau
belief an
building
VOL.

have lived late in the third century. Mr. Conybeare says that his Teaching (or discourses) 'cannot have been composed in its present form before 400 A.D.' (p. cxi). This statement, for which he offers no proof, is intended to insinuate that this teaching has been 'recast' (p. cxvi) in the interests of orthodoxy, and that it was originally Adoptionist. The one passage which our author quotes from St. Gregory¹ to corroborate this insinuation, is not only quite compatible with Catholicism; it is absolutely incompatible with Adoptionism, and Mr. Conybeare can only square it with his theory by suggesting a 'various reading' which would reduce the whole passage to incoherent nonsense, by making the first sentence flatly contradict the second. In Appendix IX. Mr. Conybeare has given us a translation from the Armenian of a letter written about A.D. 330 by Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, to the Armenians. The letter seems to show an intimate knowledge of Armenian ecclesiastical affairs, and it appears to us to prove conclusively that Adoptionism was not 'the orthodoxy of the land' about A.D. 300. Macarius deals at length with various questions of discipline, and strongly urges that baptism ought not to be deferred. There is nothing in his letter to suggest that the Armenians deferred baptism for doctrinal reasons. Macarius makes no allusion whatever to Adoptionism. At the end of the letter there are two references to Arianism, one of which shows that Macarius knew of *one* Armenian bishop 'who for a little time was united with the Arians.' The other reference is a warning against 'the proximity of Arians' at orthodox worship. Mr. Conybeare adds this note: 'This passage proves the prevalence in Armenia at that time of Arian, *i.e.* Adoptionist, opinion' (p. 184). We might as well say that the proximity of Congregationalism means the prevalence of Presbyterianism.

With regard to the fifth century, Mr. Conybeare plainly states that the tenets of the Paulicians were 'opposed to those of the great fifth-century Armenian doctors, Nerses, Sahak, Mesrop, Eliseus (p. cxviii). But he endeavours to show that the references to ritual, or sometimes the want of ritual, which occur in orthodox Armenian writers, prove that these writers were familiar with an ancient Paulician survival in the

¹ *Key*, p. cxi. Let us notice that no weight can be attached to the assertion of the Paulicians that they were 'children of the Illuminator.' The Paulicians, like the Persian Sufis, held it to be lawful to deny their belief and disguise it in every way. They would even avert suspicion by building an orthodox church: see *Key*, p. xxvii.

Armenian Church.¹ So far from this being the case, we believe that these ancient writers only show that there existed in Armenia a number of Christians whose faith was partly ignorant, partly barbaric, superficially conservative, but liable to be influenced by any teaching which was opposed to that Greek culture and Greek ritual of which many Armenians had a racial dislike. The words of Lazar of Pharp (p. cviii), *c.* A.D. 480, corroborate our view rather than the view of Mr. Conybeare, and even as late as the twelfth century there were districts where this crude and sometimes superstitious Christianity prevailed. Nerses of Lambron combats Christians who were not apparently heretical but disliked vestments, said their prayers at home, and from pious fear had adopted the very unprimitive custom of seldom or never communicating (p. clxviii). Mr. Conybeare has appealed to the writings of St. Basil as important and conclusive proof that late in the fourth century Adoptionism was popular and energetic in Armenia. He says that Letter 70 of Basil 'is important as showing that the opinion of which the triumphant spread filled Basil with such dismay was Adoptionism' (pp. cxiii, cxiv). Then comes the quotation:

'The only-born is blasphemed, the Holy Spirit dishonoured . . . there is among them a great God and a little one ; for "the Son" is not a name connoting the nature [*i.e.* of Jesus], but is esteemed a title conveying some sort of honour. The Holy Spirit is not to be complementary of the Holy Trinity, nor a sharer of the divine and blessed nature, but to belong to the realm of created things, tacked on, no matter how, to the Father and the Son.'

Mr. Conybeare, in order to guide his readers into the right path, appends here, as elsewhere, a wholly misleading note, which tells us that the passage means that 'the Sonship belonged to Jesus not through his birth, but was conferred on him when he was elected by God at the Baptism in Jordan.'²

Any reader familiar with the Arian controversies will see at a glance that Basil is speaking of the more extreme form of Arianism, such as that taught by Eunomius. The language used by the Synods of Ancyra in 358 and Alexandria in 362 make any doubt as to this fact impossible. The extreme Arians, generally known as Anomœans, taught that the Son was *unlike* the Father in essence, His essence being

¹ Some remarks on the question of ritual will be made in the course of this article.

² *Key*, p. cxiv.; *cf.* Mr. Conybeare's exposition of Hermas (*Key* p. xc.), where the Jordan is also introduced to obliterate the true meaning of a passage; for this see below.

crea
was
not
The
as a
Fath
fell
and
wors
here
tion
toni
teach
it a
be c
mius
mod
whic
the s
'only
absu
Arm
with
cellu
Adop
happ
was a
(b) E
demi
believ
and v
W
Cony
the e
1
of Ap
divini
venting
donian
Divini
Ghost
πρεσβ
Mr. C
which
heresy
Arian
mentio

created, while the essence of the Father is the fact that He was unbegotten. Therefore the name 'Son,' they taught, did not connote a unity of nature between the Father and the Son. They retained the word Trinity, but regarded the Holy Spirit as a created being, inferior to the Son; His relation to the Father and the Son was generally neglected by them, and fell outside their explanation of the life of God. The Son and Spirit though merely demi-gods were nevertheless worshipped. After misinterpreting two other references to heresies in Basil, neither of which heresies are really Adoptionist,¹ Mr. Conybeare tries to support his contention by toning down the opposition between Catholicism and the teaching of Eunomius, and then endeavouring to make it appear more reasonable to think that Basil should be opposing Adoptionism rather than Arianism. Eunomius is represented as comprehensive, conciliatory, and moderate, and a reference is made to his teaching which shows that Mr. Conybeare has entirely ignored the sense in which the party of Eunomius used the words 'only begotten Son' and 'Holy Spirit.' The climax of absurdity is reached when our author concludes that 'the Armenian heresy of the fourth century had much in common with the Arians and with the school of Eunomius and Marcellus of Ancyra' . . . though 'probably more rigorously Adoptionist' (p. cxv). That is to say, he groups together in one happy family (a) the Adoptionists, who believed that Jesus was a man who became the Son of God at His Baptism; (b) Eunomius the Arian, who believed that the Son was a demi-god who took human flesh of Mary; (c) Marcellus, who believed that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, and would be absorbed finally in the Father's personality!

We end this part of our criticism by saying that Mr. Conybeare has given us no proof from ancient writers that the early Armenian Church was Adoptionist, and that his

¹ The first of these two heresies, Letter 65, belongs to the category of Apollinarianism. When Mr. Conybeare says that it denied 'the divinity of Jesus prior to his Baptism' (*Key*, p. cxiv), he is simply inventing. The second heresy, Letter 72, is that of Eustathius the Macedonian. The Macedonians, though in no sense Adoptionists, denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Basil asserted the Divinity of the Holy Ghost so strongly that the Macedonians accused him of teaching *πρεσβύτερον εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα*. Basil indignantly denies this. Mr. Conybeare has made the blunder of supposing that the accusation which the heretics made against Basil was a description of their own heresy. For a description of Eustathius see Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*. Mr. Conybeare's mistake is without excuse, since Basil mentions Eustathius by name.

attempt to prove it is unscholarly and unreasonable. We are not justified in saying more than that there was a party of Armenians suspicious of the practices, good or bad, of those Armenians who were influenced by orthodox Greek thought, and that this party was naturally prone to accept theories opposed to Greek orthodoxy. Out of a vague, untheological, anti-Greek party Smbat organized a vigorous Church, which reproduced the main opinions of Paul of Samosata and repudiated the theology of the Greek Councils. John of Otzun, about A.D. 719, uses the word 'Paulicians' in describing Smbat's followers, and Gregory Magistros, about A.D. 1055, identifies the Thonraki with the Paulicians, says that Smbat organized them, and connects them with both the Manicheans and Paul of Samosata. What the connexion was we do not know. We can only say that it is highly probable that some Armenians had been Adoptionist, just as some were certainly Manichean¹ and many had been Arian.

The population of Armenia being broken up into independent clans, and the bishops being bishops not over a diocese but a clan, the Paulician sect was able to maintain itself against the orthodox clans. Smbat secured the assistance of bishops who seceded with him, and it is possible that the *Key of Truth* was drawn up at this period. The prayers and liturgical parts of this book are asserted by Mr. Conybeare to be older in style than the rest (p. cxix). Probably some of them had been in use at an earlier period, and this fact seems to us to account for the strongly Trinitarian character of some of the passages in the *Key* and for the similarity between the Paulician and the orthodox terminology relating to the ministry (p. cxxiv).

The Paulicians were cruelly persecuted, notably by the Empress Theodora c. A.D. 850. Large bodies of them were transported to Thrace in the eighth century, and again in the tenth. Lady Mary Wortley Montague in 1717 found a congregation of them at Philippopolis. By 1819 the last remnants of these Thracian Paulicians had become Roman Catholics. The Paulicians of Armenia still existed in the first half of the present century. Mr. Conybeare thinks that it is from among them that the American Protestants have probably drawn many of their converts. The *Key of Truth* was secured in 1837, when the orthodox Armenian bishop, Karapet, warned the Synod at Edjmiatzin of the existence of a number of Thonraki in the village Arkhweli,

¹ In A.D. 588 the Commentary of Mani on the Gospels was translated into Armenian. *Key*, p. cxxxii.

in th
invol
whic
perha

T
acco
in th
1837
prim
mixe
of th
passa
forcil
in Ar

C
origi
No h
fact
Bible
old a
sect i
Chur
apply
Pauli
Vulg
Appa
Arme
centu
Epist
(p. x
was p
as the
There
both
same
nians.
was r
eccles

¹ F
(*Key*, I
into th
using '
usage.
Peter a
nian de
to a ve

in the province of Shirak. The Russian civil power was invoked, and a number of sectaries were fined in 1845, since which time the Paulicians have been unmolested, and have perhaps become extinct.

The doctrines exhibited in the *Key of Truth* and in the account of Paulicianism given by old Armenian writers, and in the statements made by some Paulicians who recanted in 1837, do not favour the theory that the Paulicians retained a primitive Christianity. They show us a weird superstition¹ mixed with a Puritan protest against the ritual and theology of the Armenian Church and a literal adhesion to certain passages in the New Testament. The whole reminds us forcibly of some of the less educated sects which have arisen in America and England during the last century.

One of the most decisive proofs of the late and eclectic origin of these Paulicians is their use of the New Testament. No historian in the dim future who is acquainted with the fact that the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists use the Welsh Bible issued by the Church which they detest and call 'the old alien' could suppose that the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist sect is older than the Welsh Church, or a form of the Welsh Church older than, let us say, the Reformation. Let us apply the same argument to the Paulicians. The Armenian Paulicians used the authorized version of 'the Armenian Vulgate as it was completed soon after A.D. 400' (p. xxix). Apparently they did not use the Apocalypse, but the orthodox Armenians themselves rarely used it before the eleventh century (p. xciv). Photius says that they rejected the Epistles of St. Peter (p. xliii), but this rejection is doubtful (p. xxxix). If they did reject the writings of St. Peter it was probably only when they, as it seems, claimed St. Paul as their teacher and said that they execrated Peter (p. cxxix). Therefore the Paulicians appear to have originally accepted both the same translation of the New Testament and the same canon of the New Testament as the orthodox Armenians. Now this excellent translation, or rather recension, was made from Greek manuscripts at a time when Greek ecclesiastical influence was strong, at the period of those

¹ For superstitious ideas see the doctrine of the appearances of Satan (*Key*, p. 83), and the doctrine that the sacramental elements are changed into the body of the celebrant (*Key*, p. 124). The mention of 'false popes' using 'bread alone' in the Eucharist appears to allude to mediæval Latin usage. In the same way the statement that the Church universal 'is not Peter alone' (*Key*, p. 93), can hardly be a repudiation of orthodox Armenian doctrine. If these two passages do refer to the Latins, they point to a very unprimitive date.

General Councils of the Church which the Paulicians repudiated as false and the work of the devil (p. xxv). This appears to us to be an overwhelming proof that Paulicianism is not prior to Armenian orthodoxy, and the proof is rendered doubly cogent by the fact that there was an earlier Armenian translation based on the Syriac (p. cx). It is obvious that if the Paulicians had been 'old believers' they would have used the old translation and repudiated the new translation.

The Paulician doctrine of Christ's Person is very like that of the Unitarians of the seventeenth century. He is declared to be 'not God' (p. xxiv.), He 'was born a man of Mary,' at His baptism He was crowned by the Almighty Father, He was anointed, became the loved one, filled with the Godhead and Saviour of us sinners (p. 75, cf. p. 80). After His Resurrection and Ascension He became our Intercessor. While the intercession of Mary and the saints was absolutely repudiated (p. 120), the Paulicians worshipped Christ, though they denied that He is God (p. 112). The Spirit was said to have been 'made by the Father,' but was also worshipped (p. 100). And, in spite of the fact that their doctrine was plainly incompatible with a belief in the Trinity, baptism was given with three distinct affusions of water, 'In the name of the Father, in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit' (p. 98). The benediction after baptism was given thus: 'May the peace of the Father, the peace of the Son, and the peace of the Holy Ghost come unto you. Amen' (p. 101). The strongly Trinitarian tone of these formulæ, as shown in the threefold repetition of the words 'name' and 'peace,' suggests a late date. In *Didaché*, vii., we find the simpler Trinitarian form, 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'

The Paulicians denied that new-born children have either original or operative sin, and rejected and abhorred the baptism of infants. A name was given to a child eight days after his birth (p. xxxiv). Baptism must be preceded by repentance and faith, and received at the age of thirty. These practices were based upon a desire to literally imitate the life of Christ. To be 'of full age like our Lord' (p. 88, cf. p. lxxvi) was therefore held to be a necessary qualification in a catechumen. Such a theory is the outcome of an Adoptionist Christology. It assumes that men cannot receive the Holy Spirit at an earlier age than Jesus, the most holy of men. We are not aware that there is any trace of such a theory in the literature of the first three centuries. Mr. Conybeare correctly states that the practice of child-baptism

(p. cxv) about Origen's statement seem to Mr. Conybeare's practical firming the foundation to wait for approval survive in the entering Paulician survival.

These such baptism with Holy Spirit. These more anointing Paulician of the oppositely hypothetized an impossible.

Th Wednesday days a expression the Father.

Th terrible twelfth century who n Court

1 O
2 S
for the were no
3 K
C. A.D. oil. S
4 T
i. 14, a

(p. cxxi) was already existent in the time of Irenæus (born about A.D. 130), but he has overlooked the statement of Origen¹ that it was a custom derived from Apostolic times, a statement rendered highly probable by the fact that the Jews seem to have baptized the children of their proselytes. And Mr. Conybeare is not justified in appealing (p. cxxi) to the practice of the orthodox Church in the fourth century as confirming the Paulician usage. Baptism was often deferred in the fourth century by Catholics and Arians, but not in order to wait until the thirtieth year was attained, but until the approach of death. The motive was to be found not in a survival of Adoptionist theology, but in a false reverence or in the desire of men who wished to 'have their fling' before entering the service of Christ.² We therefore believe the Paulician practice to be the result of reflection and not a survival of Apostolic days.

The Paulicians, on the plea of imitating Christ, rejected such baptismal ceremonies as turning to the East, anointing with holy oil,³ and the reception of communion after baptism. These ceremonies can be traced back to A.D. 200, and it is more than probable that certain ceremonies, such as the anointing, belong to the first half of the second century.⁴ The Paulician practice was therefore either a survival of the ritual of the first century A.D. or it was deliberately drawn up in opposition to Catholic practice. We believe that the latter hypothesis best accords with the general impression which an impartial student would gain from the facts.

The Paulicians repudiated the custom of fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays (p. lxxx). The observance of these days as fast days goes back almost to Apostolic times. It is expressly inculcated in *Didaché*, viii., and Eusebius believes the Friday fast to be of Apostolic origin.

The Paulicians, Mr. Conybeare thinks, 'deferred to extreme old age' (p. l) participation in the Eucharist. In the twelfth century Nerses of Lambron speaks of Armenians who neglected the Lord's Day and prevented the nobles at Court from going to the Sacrament in church (p. lxxxv). It

¹ Origen, *Ep. ad Rom.* lib. v. 9, in *Lev. Hom.* viii. 3.

² See Chrysostom, *Homilies on Acts*, i. and x. 'Why waitest thou for the last gasp, like a runaway slave, like a malefactor, as though it were not thy duty to *live* unto God?'

³ *Key*, p. lxxvii *sqq.* Mr. Conybeare seems not to have noticed that c. A.D. 330 those Armenians whom he calls Adoptionist did use the holy oil. See the letter of Macarius, *Key*, p. 181.

⁴ These rites were old in A.D. 200; see Tert. *De Cor.* 3, *Adv. Marc.* i. 14, and Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*.

is difficult to reconcile this with the weekly communions and the reverently kept Lord's Day of the *Didaché* and other primitive documents.

Smbat was succeeded by presidents or patriarchs, who acted as the leaders of the Paulician Church (pp. cxviii, lxvii). This method of government seems to have been intended to set up a rival to the orthodox Armenian patriarchs. If so, the Paulicians did not scruple to take some hints from the orthodox Church in its developed 'grecized' form, though they denied it to be a Church.

The Paulicians rendered divine honours to their 'elect' or ministers, believing the elect to be reincarnations of Christ. As late as 1837 a Paulician who recanted deposed that he had heard a Paulician say, 'Behold, I am the Cross; light your tapers on my two hands, and give worship' (p. xxvii). The Cathars of Cologne and Trèves in 1160 held a similar opinion, and this is perhaps the best reason for believing that the Paulicians and Cathars were connected. In mentioning this strange doctrine, Mr. Conybeare, with a charity which he does not display towards the orthodox, says: 'Doubtless it was too exclusive a conception; and, if the Church which held it had emerged triumphant, instead of being extinguished by ruthless massacres, it might have led to occasional displays of sacerdotal pride' (p. lvi). After pausing for a moment to admire the impartiality of this statement, we may remark that the practice of adoring the elect as divine incarnations seems to have been connected with the habit of the Montanist prophets, who were wont to speak of themselves as God or the Paraclete.¹ As the Montanist sect was not extinct until its last members burnt themselves alive in 722, and as the orthodox even identified the Montanists and the Paulicians (p. clxxxvi), it is not unreasonable to suppose that the latter were influenced by the former.

There are grounds for believing that the Paulicians denied the Atonement (p. clxiii), a denial consistent with their theory of Christ's Person. All history has proved that the doctrine of the Atonement and the doctrine of the Incarnation stand and fall together. And although Mr. Conybeare is very angry with the mediæval writers who call the Paulicians Manicheans, and although when speaking of the Docetic Manichean doctrine of Christ's Person he scorns that doctrine as a 'deification and dissipation of Jesus Christ into a phantom or mahatma' (p. cxxxi), he seems in writing these impartial words to have forgotten that he had previously

¹ Epiph. *Hær.* xlviii. 11.

admi
Chris
Doge

T
one t
an A
ment
to hin
primi
facts
treat
the d
to cri
tion
intere

(a
custo
on th
Arme
One
from
observ
idolat
heath
and th
on De
tiani
this i
pagan
Calen
mas w
in thi
until
is pro
fourth
makes
the id
as Ch
ing in
another
signifi
was th
time, a
would

admitted that it is possible that the Paulicians denied that Christ took flesh of Mary (p. xlvj)—and so held the most Docetic doctrine that could be.

The above summary of Paulician doctrine will enable anyone to decide whether it does or does not deserve to rank as an Apostolic form of the Christian faith. Mr. Conybeare mentions various Armenian liturgical customs which appear to him to support his theory that the Paulicians retained a primitive and Apostolical Christianity. While some of the facts which he has collected are really valuable, he has treated them in the same hasty and prejudiced manner as the doctrinal books which he has quoted. We have not time to criticize his treatment in full, but we will direct the attention of our readers towards three points of considerable interest.

(a) Mr. Conybeare lays great stress upon the Armenian custom of celebrating the birth and the baptism of our Lord on the same day, January 6. He has translated from the Armenian a number of passages which defend this custom. One is a statement alleged by the Armenian writer to be from 'Afrêm' the Syrian. It declares that the Roman world observes December 25 as the birthday of Christ 'from idolatry' (p. clvii). 'Afrêm' goes on to explain that the heathen Romans kept December 25 in honour of the Sun, and that the bishops of Rome placed the feast of Christmas on December 25 because the Romans, after accepting Christianity, still took part in the pagan festival. We believe that this is substantially correct. December 25 was kept by the pagans in honour of the Sun-god, Mithra, and the Philocalian Calendar supports the theory that it was in Rome that Christmas was first kept on December 25. Mr. Conybeare is wrong¹ in thinking that the day was not observed by the Christians until 'nearly the close of the fourth century' (p. clii), but he is probably right in saying that it was not observed until the fourth century. But mark the extraordinary use which he makes of the statement of 'Afrêm.' He is not content with the idea that December 25 was chosen by the Roman bishops as Christmas Day in order to put a stop to their people joining in pagan ceremonies. He adds, 'the Roman bishops had another reason, namely to get rid of what had an Adoptionist significance' (p. clviii). Now Arianism, not Adoptionism, was the only heresy which was really feared at Rome at this time, and such a move on the part of the Roman bishops would have been little short of ridiculous. The reason

¹ See Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 248.

why Mr. Conybeare makes this fantastic suggestion is as follows:

He thinks that because the Church, or part of the Church, originally kept January 6 as a festival in honour of both the birth and the baptism of Christ, *therefore* the feast of the baptism is the feast of a birth of Christ: *therefore* the feast of the baptism is the feast of the 'spiritual birth' of Christ: *therefore* the observance of January 6 was the outcome of an Adoptionist Christology which taught that Jesus did not become endowed with Deity until He was baptized: *therefore* the observance of December 25 as distinct from January 6 was part of a diplomatic move of the upholders of Catholic doctrine, who desired to injure Adoptionism.

We shall see that when Mr. Conybeare discovers Adoptionism in Greek theology he betrays but scanty knowledge of that theology. But it is different in the case of some of these Armenian books. He has evidently read with care the passages which he quotes, and he finds that they do not help him as much as he would like. 'There was,' he says, 'in Armenia quite a literature of apology for the keeping of the Birth and Baptism on the same day. But the writers as a rule had either forgotten or ignored the real significance of the union of the two feasts' (p. cliv). On the next page Mr. Conybeare shows us exactly what he means by the forgetfulness of the ancients. He quotes from the Armenian a passage which is believed to be from Hippolytus. It says that our Lord was baptized on the same day as the day of His birth, *i.e.* on His thirtieth birthday, an idea derived from St. Luke iii. 23, and supported by other writers quoted by the Armenian, Paul of Taron (*d.* 1125). Now this does not satisfy Mr. Conybeare at all. It is 'a device' (p. clvi). It is a 'chronological schematism' (p. clvii). It was intended to counteract the Adoptionist view. Therefore we are told that Hippolytus 'overlooks the primitive reason for conjoining the two feasts, namely that the baptism was the true birth of Christ' (p. clv). But there is not a single quotation made by Mr. Conybeare in reference to this important matter which does more than show that it was an ancient custom to keep January 6 with great solemnity in honour of the two distinct events, which, according to a not unreasonable interpretation of St. Luke's words, had taken place on the same day of the year. As Mr. Conybeare has not produced a shred of evidence to prove that the festival was originally Adoptionist, and as he has admitted that the ancient Armenians 'had forgotten or

ignore
that th
(b)
observ
(p. cli
(seven
were C
ably e
as inte
noticed
he mal
fact th
munica
we unde
ate me
had ea
Euchar
in acco
our Lor
less bel
14th—
more w
surviva
part of
primitiv
(c)
a fasci
had bee
although
commun
that this
(p. clviii
that he
Otzun, a
Agape '
from the
precedin
the Lord
multas
mensam.
cannot s
Sahak d
Eucharis
translated
Agape ar

ignored' that it was Adoptionist, we are compelled to say that this sneer at Hippolytus is ill-timed.

(b) We now turn from the observance of Christmas to the observance of the Paschal festival. Mr. Conybeare gives us (p. clii) an interesting quotation from Ananias of Shirak (seventh century), showing that the *Pauliani* of that time were Quartodecimans. This is quite what we might reasonably expect in a sect of that region. We mention it partly as interesting in itself, partly because our author has not noticed the bearing which it has upon some statements which he makes about the Agape. He lays much stress upon the fact that the Paulicians ate the Agape before they communicated, and, although his language is not very definite, we understand Mr. Conybeare to mean that the Paulicians ate meat at their Agape under the impression that our Lord had eaten the Jewish Paschal lamb before He instituted the Eucharist (pp. clviii, clxiii). That is to say, the Paulicians, in accordance with Quartodeciman principles, believed that our Lord died on the 14th day of the month, and nevertheless believed that He ate one of the lambs killed upon the 14th—the two notions being mutually exclusive. Here once more we come upon something which is evidently not a survival of the Apostolic age, but an ignorant attempt on the part of the Paulicians to construct a system on imagined primitive lines.

(c) The Agape itself is a subject which always possesses a fascination for students, and we wish that Mr. Conybeare had been able to throw more light upon its history. But although he shows that the Paulicians ate the Agape before communicating, he has quite failed to prove his statement that this was 'the practice of the earliest Armenian Church' (p. clviii). Indeed, it is astonishing that he should suppose that he has adduced any proof whatever. He quotes John of Otzun, an orthodox Armenian, born in 688, to show that the Agape 'still went on, but separated by an interval of time from the Eucharist' (p. lxxxiv). But when we look at the preceding page we find that John merely says that whereas the Lord instituted the Eucharist after supper, 'nunc autem multas horas interponimus corpoream inter spiritualemque mensam.' Now this may possibly imply an Agape, but we cannot say that it certainly does. Nor do the canons of St. Sahak definitely 'indicate the custom of an Agape and Eucharist following' (p. lxxxiv). If Mr. Conybeare has translated them correctly, they imply the existence of an Agape and imply that it was considered a sin for the laity

'to eat and drink in their own houses' before the Mass. We are quite unwilling to dogmatize on the subject, but we must protest against these canons being used as a proof of non-fasting communion when they can with as much reason be used as a proof of fasting communion. This, however, does not stand alone. It is matched by the use which Mr. Conybeare makes of the *Didaché* in this connexion. We think that no candid reader can study our author's words on p. lxxxiii without being convinced that he means us to understand that the words in *Didaché* x. show that an Agape preceded the Eucharist. Having no recollection of any such thing in the *Didaché*, we opened the book again. We then saw that Mr. Conybeare has quoted the words '*after ye are satisfied thus give thanks*' without alluding to the fact that the words immediately before them contain a form of thanksgiving for the cup and bread, and also mention a qualification required of the communicants. In face of this fact it is surely more probable that the precept '*thus give thanks*' refers to a thanksgiving after the communion, either of the whole congregation or of the clergy before the communion of the laity, rather than a thanksgiving between the Agape and the communion. Moreover, in ch. xiv. the brief directions for the due observance of the Lord's Day mention the Eucharist, but ignore the Agape. We write this without wishing to deny that the compiler of the *Didaché* may have celebrated the Agape every Sunday.¹

Through page after page Mr. Conybeare has endeavoured to prove, not only that the Paulicians represented the original Armenian Church, but also that they were 'old believers,' and that Unitarianism of an Adoptionist type is a more true and original form of Christianity than the Catholic belief which recognizes in Jesus 'God of God,' miraculously born of Mary. The Adoptionist Paulician Church is declared to be 'an old form of the Apostolic Church' (p. cxxix); it is suggested that a still more extreme Adoptionism is the old form.² The

¹ The custom of certain Egyptian Christians described in Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22, and quoted by Mr. Conybeare and others as evidence of non-fasting communion, was evidently a corruption rather than a continuation, of primitive practice. These Egyptians communicated on Saturday night instead of on Sunday morning. The practice probably began in times of persecution, when it was safer to meet at night than in the early morning. There is a parallel case in Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiii. 15, where some men are rebuked for their habit of communicating in the evening in their fear lest the odour of the wine should lead to their detection.

² See the remarks on Ebionism, *Key*, p. clxxxvi.

histo
of di
far-fe
be ut
primi
fusion
unspa
not p
it wil
to wr
I.
Intro
cedin
from
of He
accep
Fragm
that M
of the
opinio
least
also m
'leave
therefo
to Ad
Unles
Gospe
Epistl
Th
which
Roma
'if, as
Christ
xc).
'comp
that th
Adopt
the Sy
beare i
shall s
read :
pneumo
not a r
the Di
womb

history of early Christendom has been ransacked in the hope of discovering wrecks of Adoptionism; no argument is too far-fetched, no omission of evidence is too glaring, if it can be utilized in the sacred cause of representing Adoptionism as primitive and Apostolic. Mr. Conybeare, with a quaint confusion of metaphors, speaks of ancient writers who 'with unsparing pens, laid the heresy bare' (p. clxxviii). We cannot promise that our pen will do anything so remarkable, but it will at least serve to transcribe some of his statements and to write a few comments upon them.

1. *Adoptionism in the Apostolic Age.*—Near the end of his Introduction Mr Conybeare says (p. clxviii): 'In the preceding pages we traced the history of Adoptionist opinion from its earliest extra-canonical expression in *The Shepherd* of Hermas. . . . ' Now the date of *The Shepherd*, if we accept the important statement made in the Muratorian Fragment, is about A.D. 140 or 150. Therefore we observe that Mr. Conybeare (a) does not say that outside the Canon of the New Testament there is any expression of Adoptionist opinion until A.D. 140; (b) he does suggest that there are at least traces of Adoptionism in the New Testament. Be it also remembered that Adoptionism is definitely called a 'leaven of the early Apostolic Church' (p. xcvi). We may therefore expect to find Mr. Conybeare calling our attention to Adoptionist doctrine in the writings of the Apostolic age. Unless we are greatly mistaken, he admits that the Synoptic Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul, or most of those Epistles, belong to that age. Where, then, are his proofs?

They do not exist. We are simply given an argument which is both circular and vicious. We are told that the Roman Adoptionists of about A.D. 200 made no idle claim, 'if, as competent teachers have acknowledged, the Adoptionist Christology is that of the Synoptic Gospels themselves' (p. xc). Underneath this there is a note in which we see that 'competent teachers' means Professor Harnack, who has said that the Scriptures might be appealed to in favour of both Adoptionism and the opposing theory, and has suggested that the Synoptic Gospels are Adoptionist. Apparently Mr. Conybeare is rather afraid of the Synoptic Gospels. Why? We shall see an excellent reason further on (p. xciii) where we read: 'In complete contrast [*i.e.* with Adoptionism] was the *pneumatic* theology, as Harnack calls it, which saw in Jesus not a man who, at a mature age, was filled or possessed with the Divine Spirit, but God Himself, putting on flesh in the womb of woman.' And in another place:

'Professor Harnack has remarked that those Adoptionists who admitted the miraculous birth of Jesus already had a foot in the rival camp. And under this aspect the Paulician faith cannot be regarded as being so pure an example of its kind as was the Ebionism of Justin's age, which held that Jesus was a man born of men' (p. clxxxvi).

If the matter were less serious, this last statement would be amusing. For it tells quite plainly that, although Paulicianism is very old and pure, it is not so old or so pure as the naked Unitarianism of the Ebionites, and leaves us to infer that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, which record that Christ was born of a Virgin, are unfavourable to the purest form of Adoptionism. They savour of *pneumatic* theology. At the best, these Gospels are half-way towards the superstitions of Catholicism.

There still remains the Gospel of St. Mark. This does not record the Virgin-birth, and, like the other Synoptic Gospels, it does not record the Baptism of Christ, an event of supreme importance among the Adoptionists, who regarded it as the occasion when Jesus received His apotheosis and was changed from a man into a demi-god. Unfortunately for Mr. Conybeare, the Paulicians admitted the authenticity of the fourth Gospel as much as that of the second, and, as he truly remarks, 'the fourth Gospel was the sheet-anchor of the rival or Alexandrine school of Christology' (p. xciii), though, 'equally with the Synoptics, it makes the descent of the Spirit upon Him in Jordan the central event in the life of Jesus.' So our author finds himself in a very great difficulty. He must either say that all the Gospels are opposed to Adoptionism or say that the fourth Gospel is not opposed to it. He chooses the latter alternative, and here parts company with Harnack, though he does not say so: 'And it may be that, after all, the fourth Gospel was susceptible of an Adoptionist interpretation.'¹ After this, we are prepared for the next paradox.

St. Paul, we should have supposed, was an 'old believer.' If we accept the admirable chronology of his life recently made by Mr. C. H. Turner in Dr. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, we grant that St. Paul's Epistles date from about A.D. 51, and it is not probable that any part of the New Testament is, in its present form, so ancient as his earliest Epistles. Now

¹ *Key*, p. xciii. In writing this, Mr. Conybeare apparently forgot that he had previously stated in the most express manner that in the Adoptionist scheme 'there is clearly no room for the view that Jesus was born the incarnate God' (*Key*, p. lxxxviii).

the
fess
is of
The
vene
their
Test
stat
from
Chri
them
char
boun
say :
noth
of th
self
2
now
the
absen
A
says
flouri
from
find
age'
of H
Adop
metic
Adop
region
(a
know
which
your]
decla
he app
by H
that t
charac
1 A
'Jesus
half-div
in the f
He ent

the Paulicians accepted St. Paul's Epistles, although, as Professor Harnack has truly stated, the Christology of St. Paul is of a kind which is diametrically opposed to Adoptionism. The fact that the Paulicians accepted these writings and venerated their writer is only one of the many proofs that their heresy was elaborated after the Canon of the New Testament was already fixed. But Mr. Conybeare, instead of stating that the Christology of St. Paul was absolutely different from Adoptionism,¹ says: 'There was in the Adoptionist Christology nothing to lead its adherents to specially affiliate themselves to the Apostle Paul' (p. cxxix). It is hard to characterize this sentence without seeming to transgress the bounds of courtesy. But if an orthodox theologian were to say: 'There was in the Eucharistic doctrine of Mr. Spurgeon nothing to lead him to specially affiliate himself to the Fathers of the Council of Trent,' such a theologian would place himself on a level with Mr. Conybeare.

2. *Alleged Adoptionism of the Second Century.*—We may now turn from the writings of the first century, from which the Apostolic 'leaven' of Adoptionism is conspicuously absent, to the writings of the second century.

At the conclusion of a long argument Mr. Conybeare says: 'So far we have found the Adoptionist theology flourishing both in Rome, in Palestine, and in Asia Minor, from the very earliest age' (p. xciv). We confess that we find it difficult to reconcile the words 'from the very earliest age' with the previously quoted statement that *The Shepherd* of Hermas is the 'earliest extra-canonical expression' of Adoptionism. However, we will leave this strange arithmetic and examine the proofs which are alleged to prove that Adoptionism was 'flourishing' in three important Christian regions.

(a) *Palestine.*—Mr. Conybeare quotes (p. xci) the well-known passage in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue*, ch. 48, in which Trypho the Jew says, 'There are some of our [or your] persuasion who admit that he is the Messiah, but declare him to have been a man of men.' On the next page he appropriately quotes the description given of the Ebionites by Hippolytus, and points out the fact, which no one denies, that the Christology of the Ebionites is of the Adoptionist character which is represented in the *Key*. So far, so good.

¹ Any person of intelligence can judge whether St. Paul believed that 'Jesus was mere man until he reached his thirtieth year' and then made half-divine at His baptism, or whether he believed that the Son existed in the form of God before His incarnation and humbled Himself when He entered the world.

But on p. viii he says, 'We are only acquainted with the early Christianity of the Jewish Church through the reports of those who were hostile to it, and who gave to it the name of Ebionite.'

Now, the oldest description of the early Christianity of the Jewish Church is to be found in *Acts*. All recent investigation has tended to show that *Acts* is an historical document of the greatest importance, and it is exceedingly difficult to place it later than A.D. 80. And the earliest description of the heresy which later writers called Ebionism is to be found in the *Dialogue* of Justin, which was written about A.D. 155. What grounds, then, does Mr. Conybeare allege to prove that early Jewish Christianity was Ebionite? None, except some statements in the Jewish Christian document known as the *Didaché*, and probably written at the close of the first century. The *Didaché* teaches the immanence of Christ in the prophet, and interprets the Eucharist 'as a meal symbolic of the unity of all the faithful' (p. clxiii), enjoins baptism in living water, and has a statement about the Eucharist which our author interprets to mean that the Agape was eaten before the Eucharist. But, as Mr. Conybeare himself shows, the doctrine that Christ is immanent in the believer is taught by St. John and St. Paul, and St. Paul expressly insists on the idea of the Sacrament being a symbol of unity. The custom of eating the Agape before the Eucharist proves nothing. According to Mr. Conybeare's own statement this was usual in part of Egypt, and Egypt was the special home of that theology which Adoptionism detested. The baptism in living water is not necessarily an Adoptionist practice, but may be a Palestinian survival of an Apostolic practice. We have no right to call it Adoptionist until we have first proved that Apostolic Christianity was Adoptionist; and this Mr. Conybeare has conspicuously failed to do.

While he makes the most of the parallels between the *Didaché* and the *Key*, our author seems to have forgotten that in *Didaché* x. 6, Christ is called 'the God of David,' and that the words 'Maran atha' are to be recited at the Eucharist, as though to indicate a belief in a special Divine Presence of Christ at this sacred service. We leave our Unitarian friends to combine these facts with the theory that Christ was 'a man of men.'¹

¹ In his Preface, p. xii, Mr Conybeare makes the astounding assertion that the 'absence of a hierarchy' is a point in common between the *Key* and the *Didaché*. The *Didaché* (xiii, xv) has a ministry of prophets or ἀρχιερείς, ἐπίσκοποι, and διάκονοι, and also teachers.

the s
Jewis
Gent
Divin
the e
Arist
nity o
impor
was i
used
Jewis
that a
amon
W
Christ
state
which
that t
tionist
(b)
the ve
of the
words
belong
Th
rejecte
contem
some o
Mr. C
once e
true w
seems
the Mo
Gospel
of Chri
Synopt
attenti
the fou
such A
regard
rejected

¹ *Didaché*
² See
by Epiph
VOL.

Equally remarkable is Mr. Conybeare's forgetfulness of the statement of Justin¹ with regard to the other section of Jewish Christians who did not regard the Law as binding on Gentile Christians, and who apparently believed in the Divinity of Christ and were the genuine representatives of the early Jewish Church. He has also made no allusion to Ariston of Pella, who believed in the pre-existence and Divinity of Christ, or to Hegesippus, whose evidence is of unique importance. He was an orthodox Palestinian Christian, who was in Rome about A.D. 150, and wrote *Memoirs* extensively used by Eusebius. He certainly seems to have regarded the Jewish Church as essentially orthodox, although he shows that after the death of Symeon, in A.D. 104, heresies were rife among the Jewish Christians.

While, therefore, we admit that there were Adoptionist Christians in Palestine during the second century, we must state our conviction that Mr. Conybeare has ignored evidence which he ought to have quoted, and that he has not proved that the early Christianity of the Jewish Church was Adoptionist as he has asserted (p. viii).

(b) *Asia Minor*.—Did Adoptionism flourish there 'from the very earliest age'? We are asked to believe this because of the existence of the sect called Alogi, and because of some words of Melito, Bishop of Sardis. Both the Alogi and Melito belong to the second half of the second century.

The ridiculous and ignorant persons known as Alogi rejected the fourth Gospel and ascribed it to Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John, who taught the exact opposite of some of the most salient doctrines in the fourth Gospel. If Mr. Conybeare had mentioned this fact, he would have at once enabled us to estimate the testimony of the Alogi at its true worth. They were opponents of the Montanists, and it seems probable that they rejected the fourth Gospel because the Montanist doctrine of the Paraclete was based upon that Gospel. They seem to have accepted the miraculous birth of Christ and to have constructed a theology based upon the Synoptic Gospels.² Mr. Conybeare's logic here deserves attention. On the same page (xciii) he wishes us to regard the fourth Gospel as compatible with Adoptionism because such Adoptionists as Theodotus accepted it, and wishes us to regard the Alogi as practically Adoptionist because they rejected the fourth Gospel and its teaching.

¹ *Dialogue* 47.

² See Epiph. *Hær.* li. 4, liv. 1; it is doubtful whether the sources used by Epiphanius did prove the Alogi to be Adoptionists.

Melito is the next proof that Adoptionism flourished in Asia Minor. That a distinguished writer and bishop of a district so strongly steeped with *pneumatic* theology, should have had any tendency to Adoptionism is so surprising that we will quote the more important of the two passages alleged. Mr. Conybeare says that in this fragment 'we find the baptism emphasized as the turning-point in the life of Jesus Christ, before which he was a mere man, after which he was God.' We observe here that Melito is treated as a Psilanthropist, his doctrine is described as pure Ebionism. Now for the quotation given by our author:

'The things done *after the baptism* by Christ, and especially the signs, manifested the Godhead of him hidden in flesh (*τὴν αὐτοῦ κεκρυμμένην ἐν σαρκὶ θεότητα ἐδηλοῦν*) and assured the world of it. For the same person being God at once and perfect man, he assured us of his two essences (*τὰς δύο αὐτοῦ οὐσίας*): namely, of his Godhead by means of the signs in the three years after the baptism, and of his humanity in the thirty years (*χρόνους*) which preceded the baptism, in which owing to the imperfection of the flesh (*διὰ τὸ ἀτελὲς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*), the signs of his Godhead were concealed, *although being true God before the æons*' (p. xciv).

'The last words, in italics,' says Mr. Conybeare, 'are out of all grammatical relation with what precedes, and must be set down to the excerptor.' This is rather bold treatment; if we were to cut out from St. Paul's Epistles everything that is out of all grammatical relation with what precedes it, we should manufacture a strange kind of Paulinism. However, supposing our critic is correct, how can he venture to describe Melito as having taught that Jesus was 'a mere man' before His baptism? Melito distinctly asserts that Christ was truly God, but that the Godhead was, as Irenæus says, quiescent. When the human nature was mature and He was baptized, the Godhead of Christ revealed itself in His miracles. We are glad to see that Mr. Conybeare is uneasy at his own temerity, and tones down his previous assertion by saying: 'Melito's view, then, was that Jesus was merely human, or at most potentially divine, before the baptism. The divinity till then lay hidden in him' (*loc. cit.*). But to be 'merely human' is different from being 'potentially divine,' and to be 'potentially divine' is not the same thing as to have a true Godhead, the 'signs' of which are temporarily concealed.

So we are assured that Adoptionism flourished in Asia Minor 'from the very earliest age,' although we have no proof of any such thing in either the Apostolic age or the sub-Apostolic age. We have to be content with the knowledge

that
an i
educ
bear
and
in a
grea
was
with
pneu
that
and
both
The
prob
tioni
with
us th
total
(
with
we to
very
was t
Son o
'the e
T
Adop
about
excon
in the
discus
posed
certain
what
taught
baptiz
this
mirack
that J
God
heretic
air the
prised
Se

that late in the second century there existed in Asia Minor an ignorant sect which was possibly Adoptionist, and a highly educated bishop who was not Adoptionist at all. Mr. Conybeare is strangely silent about the Christology of Ignatius and Polycarp, though the name of the former is mentioned in a note on the baptism of our Lord (p. xcvi). These two great saints show us the real theology of Asia Minor as it was early in the second century, a theology in close contact with that of St. John and St. Paul, and of a completely *pneumatic* character. And we must not forbear to mention that although they sharply rebuke the heresies of their day, and Ignatius includes a Judaizing heresy in his rebukes, they both seem wholly unconscious of the existence of Adoptionism. The *Apocalypse*, which was undoubtedly written in Asia Minor, probably about A.D. 93, contains no reference to Adoptionism, is inconsistent with Adoptionism, and combines with the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp in suggesting to us that in the early Church of Asia Minor Adoptionism was totally unknown.

(c) *Rome*.—It is to Rome that Mr. Conybeare appeals with most confidence and with least success. Not only are we told that Adoptionist theology flourished there 'from the very earliest age' (p. xciv), but even that its 'earliest cradle' was there (p. ci). And again, the view that Jesus 'became Son of God *per profectum* and by election,' was tolerated in 'the earliest Roman Church' until the year 190 (p. clxxvii).

The information which ancient authors give us about Adoptionism in Rome is as follows. It was brought to Rome about 190 by a tanner named Theodotus, who was promptly excommunicated by Pope Victor.¹ The heresy is described in the book known as the *Philosophoumena*. We cannot here discuss the question whether the *Philosophoumena* was composed by Hippolytus. It is enough to say that the author certainly lived about A.D. 200, and that he shows us exactly what the character of this Adoptionism was.² Theodotus taught that 'Jesus was a man born of a virgin;' when he was baptized 'Christ' descended upon him in the form of a dove; this 'Christ' was the Spirit. Jesus then began to work miracles. Some members of the school of Theodotus said that Jesus never became God at all; others, that he became God 'after the resurrection from the dead.' Now the early heretics, from the time of Simon Magus onwards, loved to air their opinions upon the seven hills. So we are not surprised to find that, in the time of Zephyrinus, Asclepiodotus

¹ See Eus. *H. E.* v. 28, 6.

² *Philos.* vii. 35; Ps-Tert. 8.

and another Theodotus, a banker, spread a similar though not quite identical doctrine. It was taught that Christ was a 'mere man,' born of the Holy Spirit and of Mary,¹ and that the Holy Spirit who had created Him rested upon Him at His baptism. This school seems to have kept rather closer than their predecessors to the teaching of the New Testament. They attributed some kind of pre-existence to the Son of God, believing that He was specially manifested in Melchizedek.² They maintained that this doctrine had been taught by 'the Apostles themselves,' and that 'the truth of the message had been kept until the times of Victor.'³ Evidently they argued that because Adoptionism had not been condemned until the times of Victor, it had been taught until the times of Victor. Their contemporaries, so far from admitting this, said 'they have set aside the rule of the ancient faith, and been ignorant of Christ.'⁴

We have every reason to think their opponents were historically right in thinking that these Adoptionists were setting aside 'the ancient faith' of Rome. A continuous chain of evidence exists to show that the faith of Rome was not Adoptionist. The Epistles of St. Paul, whether written to Rome or from Rome, are *pneumatic* in their Christology. The Epistles of St. Peter are wholly free from Adoptionism. For our own part, we believe in the genuineness of both these Epistles. Theologians of Mr. Conybeare's school generally reject them. And if they are right in placing the First Epistle late in the first century, and the Second Epistle in the middle of the second century, they are furnishing themselves with fresh difficulties in believing that Adoptionism existed in Rome before the days of the tanner. The Epistle of St. Clement, bishop of Rome, written about A.D. 97 is not Adoptionist. Ignatius, in A.D. 110, shows the warmest admiration for the Roman Church, and was ever venerated there. We have already noticed that his teaching is strongly *pneumatic*. St. Polycarp belongs to the same school of thought, and he was received with warm friendliness by Anicetus, bishop of Rome, in 154 or 155. St. Irenæus continues the same tradition. He was acquainted with the Roman Church and visited its bishop in 177. The ancient homily, popularly but erroneously called the Second Epistle of Clement, written most probably in Rome about 140, asserts the Godhead of Christ in the strongest terms. Finally, the Apostles' Creed, which was in use in the Roman Church about 140, and

¹ Ps.-Tert. 8.² Eus. *H. E.* v. 28, 3.³ Epiph. *Har.* iv. 8.⁴ Eus. *loc. cit.*

possi
in th
from
H
that
age'
exist
Theo
of th
Rome
herd
necte
enthu
L
herd,
when
that
Catho
and d
rever
andria
school
Also
pealed
that
the d
accou
penite
W
own q
(pp. 12
'T
compo
in its
Simil.
pre-exi
(i.e. hu
the Ho
ness an
fore,' be
the Spi
and ma
the Ho
was not
took (2
the end

possibly much earlier, asserts the existence of three Persons in the Godhead, and sharply distinguishes the Holy Ghost from Christ.

How, then, does Mr. Conybeare support his statement that Adoptionism flourished in Rome 'from the very earliest age'? He supports it by (a) omitting all the evidence which exists to the contrary; (b) assuming that there was only one Theodotus, and accepting as true the statement of the party of the second Theodotus, that Adoptionism was taught in Rome until the times of Victor; (c) appealing to *The Shepherd* of Hermas, this being the one and only document connected with the primitive Roman Church which even the enthusiasm of Mr. Conybeare can depict as Adoptionist.

Let us first notice that Hermas, the author of *The Shepherd*, was brother of Pius who was bishop of Rome at a time when the Apostles' Creed was in use. Let us further observe that *The Shepherd* enjoyed a high reputation among the Catholics during a period when the Church was consciously and deliberately antagonistic to Adoptionism, and that it was revered by such men as Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, both of whom were able theologians of the *pneumatic* school, the latter being an extreme member of that school. Also that we have no record of the Adoptionists having appealed to *The Shepherd* in spite of its wide circulation, and that Tertullian, who was specially interested in maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity, detests *The Shepherd*, not on account of its Christology, but on account of its doctrine of penitence.

We shall best do justice to Mr. Conybeare if we cite his own quotation from *The Shepherd* and his comment upon it (pp. lxxxix, xc).

'*The Shepherd* of Hermas, a document of the Roman Church, composed long before the New Testament canon was fixed, is similar in its teaching to the second chapter of the *Key*. Therein, in Simil. v. 5, we read as follows: "God made His Holy Spirit, which pre-existed and created all creation, to enter and dwell in the flesh (*i.e.* human body) which He approved. This flesh therefore, in which the Holy Spirit took up its dwelling, served the Spirit well in holiness and purity, having never in any way polluted the Spirit. Therefore, because it had lived well and purely, and had laboured with the Spirit and worked therewith in every matter, conversing bravely and manfully, God chose (*ἐλάρο*) it to be a participator along with the Holy Spirit. For this flesh walked as pleased God, because it was not polluted upon earth, having the Holy Spirit. God therefore took (*ἐλαβε*) into counsel the Son and the angels in their glory, to the end that this flesh, having blamelessly served the Spirit, might

furnish, as it were, a place of tabernacling (for the Spirit), and might not seem to have lost the reward of its service. For all flesh shall receive the reward which shall be found without stain or spot, and in it the Holy Spirit shall make its home."

'We could hardly find a clearer expression than the above extract affords of the cardinal doctrines of the *Key*, namely, that the man Jesus, being flesh, was, because of his progress in moral excellence, chosen by God and endowed with authority and lordship by the Holy Spirit, which in Jordan came down and dwelt in him; and, secondly, that the faithful who acquit themselves, like Jesus, nobly, shall receive from God the same guerdon, the same grace of the Spirit as he.'

In the first place, Mr. Conybeare has made a mistake in the reference. The passage is in *Simil.* v. 6, and not in v. 5. But that is a trifle. What is really serious is that *Mr. Conybeare has omitted more than one third of the chapter.* In this part of the chapter Hermas explains why the Son of God 'is not represented in the guise of a servant,' and this Son of God who 'cleansed the sins of His people' is said to be He who 'placed the angels in charge of them' when they were created. That is to say, Jesus, instead of being a man who became the Son of God at His baptism, is said by Hermas to have been Son of God, ruling angels and men before the Incarnation!

The kindest supposition that we can make is that Mr. Conybeare has not read *The Shepherd*, but only an extract from it, and this supposition is corroborated by his omission of the striking passage in *Simil.* ix. 12. In this latter passage it is said that 'The Son of God is older than all His creation, so that He became the Father's Adviser in His creation.' This Divine Son is said to have been 'made manifest in the last days of the consummation,' and 'a man cannot enter into the Kingdom of God except by the name of His Son that is beloved by Him.' In *Simil.* ix. 14 it is actually said that 'all creation is sustained by the Son.' It still remains for us to add a few words in explanation of the passage which Mr. Conybeare has seen fit to quote. It says nothing whatever about the Jordan or the baptism of Christ, so that Mr. Conybeare has merely put into it a theory which is not there. The real peculiarities about it are that it (1) calls the divine nature of Christ 'Spirit' or 'Holy Spirit,' and (2) calls the Third Person of the Trinity 'Son.' The latter peculiarity is bizarre, but quite explicable. For the passage, although Mr. Conybeare has overlooked the fact, is only a brief exposition of a 'parable' composed by Hermas in *Simil.* v. 2. In this parable a Master (God the Father) plants a vine and

entru
care
Spirit
by ad
we lo
'flesh
or ta
which
(cf. I
passa
taber
licen
τὴν ἁ
were

T
'Spir
Herm
Theo
'Chri
Spirit
Chris
Adop
Seco
writ
ment
xv. 4
in St
in the
Mr. F
right
same
Theop
Prax
Herm
be fou
same
which
Spirit
Conyl
name
title
and a
has th
lic the
He th

entrusts it to a Servant (Christ), who tends it with perfect care. The Master returns, calls together His Son (the Holy Spirit) and His friends (the angels) and rewards the Servant by admitting Him to share in the heritage of His Son. If we look at the conclusion of Simil. v. 6 we see that the 'flesh' of Christ is glorified by being given a place of sojourn or tabernacling. This naturally refers to the Ascension, which is regarded as a reward for the human nature of Christ. (*cf.* Phil. ii. 7, 9). Mr. Conybeare, in order to make the passages fit with his theory that the flesh was first made the tabernacle of Deity at the baptism, takes the extraordinary licence of translating *ἵνα καὶ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτῆς . . . σχῇ τόπον τινὰ κατασκηνώσεως* 'that this flesh . . . might furnish as it were a place of tabernacling (for the Spirit).'

The peculiarity of calling the divine nature of the Lord 'Spirit' might plausibly be urged as a possible proof that Hermas is Adoptionist. For some Adoptionists, such as Theodotus the tanner, called the higher element in Jesus 'Christ,' and said this 'Christ' was simply an impersonal Spirit of the Father. But no one acquainted with the Christology of the primitive Church could find a proof of Adoptionism in Hermas's use of the word 'Spirit.' The Second Person of the Trinity is repeatedly called 'Spirit' by writers utterly opposed to Adoptionism. In the New Testament we have this name used in 2 Cor. iii. 17, and in 1 Cor. xv. 45. The divine nature of Christ seems to be called Spirit in St. John vi. 63, and, in spite of what is said to the contrary in the admirable commentary on Romans by Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam, we are inclined to think that Dr. Liddon was right in so interpreting the word 'Spirit' in Romans i. 4. The same use of the word is found in Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* v. 1, 2; Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* ii. 10; Tertullian, *Apol.* 21, *Adv. Prax.* 8, 26. These writers are nearly contemporary with Hermas, but one of the plainest parallels to his language is to be found in a writing which is probably of almost exactly the same date as *The Shepherd*. We refer to 2 Clement ix., in which it is said, 'Christ the Lord who saved us, being first Spirit, became flesh and thus called us.' And here Mr. Conybeare himself comes to our aid. He has accepted the name *pneumatic* (pp. xc note, cxci, cxiii), as an appropriate title for the Catholic doctrine which opposes Adoptionism and asserts that the Son is 'God Himself' (p. cxciii). He has therefore tacitly admitted that it is consistent with Catholic theology to call the divine nature of Jesus Christ *Pneuma*. He therefore has rendered himself incapable of labelling an

ancient writer as Adoptionist on the ground of his having called the divine nature of Jesus Christ *Pneuma*. Mr. Conybeare has spiked his last gun.

So much for the alleged Adoptionism of the 'earliest Roman Church.' The one book which Mr. Conybeare can produce in favour of the primitive Unitarianism of Rome is a book which calls the world the creation of the Son, says that He sustains 'all creation,' that the angels do Him service, and that by His name alone can man be saved. After annexing such a comedy of errors to the *Key of Truth*, it is hardly appropriate in our author to go out of his way to write a note (p. xcii), ridiculing the statement of St. Hippolytus that it was a 'new heresy' which Theodotus introduced into Rome. Everything goes to prove that Hippolytus was right. We do not at any point blame Mr. Conybeare merely for arriving at conclusions different from our own. But we do deny that any author has the right, in the interests of any school of theology whatever, to quote as definite proofs of his own views statements which will reasonably bear exactly the opposite interpretation. Still less has he the right to treat any ancient author as Gregory, Macarius, Basil, Melito, Hermas, and Hippolytus have been treated in this search for the 'leaven of the early Apostolic Church.'

Mr. Conybeare has supplied us with many useful pieces of information in his *Key of Truth*, but the book as a whole is such a complete distortion of the facts that we should be compelled to call it a wilful and deliberate distortion if it did not contain so many marks of ignorance, self-contradiction, and haste.

ART. VI.—SECONDARY EDUCATION.

1. *A Bill for the Organization of Secondary Education*, approved by the Head Masters' Conference; the Incorporated Association of Head Masters; the Head Mistresses' Association; the Conference of Catholic Schools; and the Hebdomadal Council of the University of Oxford.
2. *Board of Education Bill*, introduced by the Lord President.
3. *Teachers' Registration Bill*, introduced by the Lord President.

ONCE more we have to face an Education Bill: this time it will chiefly concern the secondary education of the country,

but
it is
prin
tion,
evid
tory
cann
to re
spec
that
asser
which
educ
prese

T
must
subje
us, b
which
educ
them
half-c
us, w
quire
plaus

B
broug
issued

'T
of the
difficu
ancien
all ag
Educat
the int
us the
with v
trainin
Second
many o
for mai
possess
afford

'Bu
ought
What i
teach?

but we may take it for granted that the new Act, whenever it is passed, will have considerable influence in laying down principles on which elementary, as well as secondary, education, will be conducted at no distant date. For it must be evident to all thoughtful persons that the present unsatisfactory arrangements with respect to elementary education cannot be permanent. The country is evidently beginning to realize this; and such an Act as that authorizing the special aid grant to voluntary schools marks the progress that has been already made. In a country which places the assertion of religious liberty among the principles upon which legislation is to be based, it is impossible that an educational system which contradicts that principle, as our present system does, can permanently hold its ground.

That there is great need for a Secondary Education Bill must be evident to all who take an intelligent interest in the subject. We have good schools and bad schools among us, but it is left to individuals to find out for themselves to which of these classes any school belongs; and while well-educated parents may be able to determine the question for themselves without much difficulty, it must be obvious that half-educated parents, of whom we have so many among us, who are anxious to educate their children well, do require assistance to protect them from the pretentious and plausible representations of incompetent teachers.

Besides this all is now left to chance, and requires to be brought into order. This is well set forth in a leaflet recently issued, which says:

‘The task of reforming Secondary Education is necessarily one of the most difficult of social problems in any State. It is doubly difficult in a country like our own, where it is desired to bring ancient traditions into closer harmony with modern needs. We are all agreed that in England we want more facilities for Secondary Education. The growing complexity of the duties of citizenship, the international struggle in commerce and industry, are forcing upon us the duty of providing the rising generation—boys and girls—with wider opportunities for obtaining in youth the intellectual training and the moral discipline furnished by a good system of Secondary Schools. The need for good Secondary Schools is in many districts urgent. Equally urgent in other districts is the need for maintaining the high standard of the schools which we already possess. Year by year the urgency grows. As a nation we cannot afford to delay.

‘But in order to supply our need, we must know clearly what we ought to provide. What does “Secondary Education” mean? What is to be the aim of our Secondary Schools? What are they to teach? What shall we require as the irreducible minimum of a

Secondary Education properly so called? How are we to test their work? These are questions which must be answered, and answered distinctly before we can properly act. Other nations have decided these questions. But on these points there has been in England too much vague generalization, and too little precision of thought. If we were given to-morrow full powers to equip and maintain as many Secondary Schools as we pleased, it is to be feared that we should find ourselves unprepared to say exactly what we wanted to do. Yet, until our aim is clear and until we have defined the object of our enterprise, we cannot design the machinery which shall best produce what is wanted. Because we have not set ourselves as a nation to define our educational aims, much that we have done has been well-intentioned but mischievous.

'For us in England the difficulty of the problem is increased by the fact that, whatever we do, we must avail ourselves of a great number of existing institutions. We are not set to build upon an empty field. We have, as it were, to restore, adapt, and enlarge old buildings. Much of what we have is, by universal admission, extremely good. Much on the other hand is—by equally universal admission—extremely bad. The wheat and the tares are intermixed. But without much skilful and patient inquiry we shall not be able to separate the good from the bad, the useful from the mischievous. In order to accomplish this initial task, we shall need competent and dispassionate investigation by inspectors independent alike of local influences and sectional prejudice.'

There is no better or clearer description of the present position of Secondary Education than that just quoted from a paper headed 'Considerations Worth Weighing,' for which the Head Masters' Association is responsible. It proceeds further to describe difficulties which have to be avoided, with some of which we shall have to deal when their proposals for legislation come under review.

The first step towards obtaining accurate information concerning the whole of the present provision for secondary education was made very recently by the Lords of the Council on Education. They say in their introductory memorandum:

'In England there are no official statistics showing the number of pupils receiving instruction in the schools which fill the gap between the public elementary schools and the universities or university colleges. These schools are very various in character, in constitution, and in size. They differ so widely in the leaving age of their scholars, that it would be misleading to regard them as forming a single category. But, broadly speaking, they furnish to the country what is known as secondary or intermediate education in its different grades, together with a certain number of schools which, though apparently giving what is practically primary education only, cannot, in the absence of official inspection, be decisively placed in one grade or another. Some are boarding-schools, some are only

for d
in va
or of
mitte
comp
some
by R
Chan
under
ment.
boys
tion a
appro
public
in exi
be ex
never
inquir

T

'I
on wh
Educa
as exh
their g
only b
same t
all stat
becaus
some s
and m
interm
name r
dary s
others.
inquiry
other p
second
countie
and the
Educati
valuable
schools

It
state o
what s
recently
Preside
more a

for day-scholars, others have boarders and day-scholars alike, though in varying proportions. Some are the property of private individuals, or of partners in private enterprise; some are controlled by committees representing bodies of subscribers; some are the property of companies formed under articles of association with limited liability; some are controlled by local public authorities; some are regulated by Royal Charter, by Act of Parliament, by scheme of the Court of Chancery, by scheme under the Charitable Trusts Acts, by scheme under the Endowed Schools Acts, or by some other legal instrument. Some are for boys only, some for girls only, some for both boys and girls. But as there is no general system of public inspection applying to all the schools alike, it is not possible, with any approach to accuracy, to classify the whole number of schools, public and private, into grades of educational service. Nor is there in existence any list or register of these schools which pretends to be exhaustive. The whole subject is exceedingly obscure, and has never been brought within the scope of comprehensive statistical inquiry.

To make another quotation from the same Return :

'In submitting the following statistical abstract, and the tables on which it is based, the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education desire to point out that the Return must not be regarded as exhaustive. Nor does it attempt to classify schools according to their grade or educational efficiency. Any such distinction could only be made after a long process of careful inspection. At the same time, until some such classification can be authoritatively made all statistics of English secondary education must be cautiously used, because it is well known that there is a greater difference between some secondary schools and others than there is between the latter and many of those which are classed as elementary. Indeed, so intermixed are the English schools that some which are secondary in name may be elementary in fact, and *vice versa*. . . . Of the secondary schools in certain districts more is known than of those in others. The Royal Commission on Secondary Education made inquiry in 1894-95 through their Assistant Commissioners and from other persons into the number and age of pupils attending endowed secondary and proprietary schools for boys and girls in seven selected counties, viz. Bedford, Devon, Lancaster, Norfolk, Surrey, Warwick, and the West Riding of Yorkshire. And in 1895 the Technical Education Board of the London County Council conducted a valuable inquiry into the number of pupils attending secondary schools in London.'

It is essential for us to grasp thoroughly the existing state of things before we can form any judgment respecting what steps ought to be taken. In this respect the Bills recently laid on the table of the House of Lords by the Lord President of the Council show a marked advance upon the more ambitious measure introduced by the Government in

1896, which failed to secure the necessary support. The plan now proposed by Government is to proceed cautiously, to take steps by which accurate information may be obtained, as well as to lay a foundation upon which legislation may be safely built when the required knowledge has been gained. In this respect the Government measures have a decided advantage over the Bill that has been approved by the Executives of the Head Masters' Conference, the Incorporated Association of Head Masters, the Head Mistresses' Association, the Conference of Catholic Schools, and by the Hebdomadal Council of the University of Oxford, and which has upon its back, as its introducers, the names of Colonel Lockwood, Right Hon. J. G. Talbot, Professor R. C. Jebb, Lord E. Talbot, Mr. H. Hobhouse, Mr. Guy Pym, Mr. W. Jones, and Mr. W. F. Laurence.

It may be well, therefore, to explain, in the first instance, the Government proposals; after that to point out where they agree with and where they differ from the proposals of the Bill of the Head Masters' Conference, and after that to say something concerning the additional proposals made by that Conference.

One of the Government Bills deals with the establishment of a Board to supervise education, whether elementary or secondary; the other is intended to secure the registration of teachers. The proposed

'Board of Education is to consist of the Lord President of the Council, Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, the First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Treasury, the Chancellor of Her Majesty's Exchequer, and one other person appointed by Her Majesty the Queen, and holding office during Her Majesty's pleasure; and it shall be lawful for Her Majesty to appoint a President, and, if he is Lord President of the Council, a Vice-President of the Board.'

It would not, therefore, materially differ from the present Council on Education. This

'Board of Education shall take the place of the Education Department (including the Department of Science and Art), and all enactments and documents shall be construed accordingly; and as from the establishment of the Board of Education the Education Department Act 1856 shall be repealed.'

Besides this:

'There shall be exercised by the Board of Education the powers conferred on the Charity Commissioners by any scheme made in pursuance of the Endowed Schools Acts 1869 to 1889, except that—

'(a) Any power with respect to a question as to the construction

of a
Com

prop
Cha
Edu

Com
may

suan
tion
those

other
inspe
the t
Trust
that
by th
gover

by or
advise
Comm

F

would
elem
autho
almo
quest
would
earne
which
to tr
belon

worse

W
Regis

'F
teacher
(herein
body c

¹ T
c. 137)
Act, 18
Trusts

of a scheme or other document shall be exercised by the Charity Commissioners; and

‘(b) Any power with respect to the control or management of property forming the capital of any endowment shall be exercised by Charity Commissioners with the concurrence of the Board of Education;

‘And for this purpose the powers exercisable by the Charity Commissioners under the enactments mentioned in the Schedule¹ may also be exercised by the Board of Education.

‘The Charity Commissioners shall, in framing schemes in pursuance of the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1889, act in consultation with the Board of Education, and shall frame a scheme under those Acts if so requested by the Board.

‘In addition to any powers exercisable under this section or otherwise, the Board of Education may, by their officers, visit, inspect, and examine any school, and give certificates in respect of the teaching therein, whether the school is subject to the Charitable Trusts Acts or the Endowed Schools Acts or not. Provided that in the case of a school not so subject, the power conferred by this sub-section shall be exercised only with the consent of the governing body of the school.

‘It shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council from time to time, by order, to appoint a consultative committee for the purpose of advising the Board of Education on any matter referred to the Committee by the Board.’

Before proceeding to examine the other draft Bills, we would say that we cordially approve the plan of placing elementary and secondary schools under the same supreme authority. This will prevent that friction which would be almost inevitable if we had two supreme authorities. The question to which of the two this or that school belonged would be continually arising, and the natural desire of all earnest men for the success of the particular authority to which themselves belong would afford frequent temptations to trespass on fields of work which would more properly belong to the rival authority, and so confusion or something worse would ensue.

We now turn to the other Government Bill, the Teachers Registration Bill. It would enact that:

‘For the purpose of forming and maintaining a register of teachers in England and Wales, there shall be established a Council (hereinafter referred to as the Council), and the Council shall be a body corporate by the name of the Teachers’ Registration Council,

¹ These Acts are The Charitable Trusts Act, 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 137), sections nine to fifteen; The Charitable Trusts Amendment Act, 1855 (18 & 19 Vict. c. 124), sections six to nine; The Charitable Trusts Act, 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 136), sections nineteen and twenty.

with power to acquire and hold land for the purpose of their duties without licence in mortmain.

'The Council shall consist of—

'(a) Six persons appointed by Her Majesty the Queen with the advice of Her Privy Council ;

'(b) One person elected by each of the following bodies :

The Hebdomadal Council of the University of Oxford,
The Council of the Senate of the University of Cambridge,

The Senate of the University of Durham,

The Senate of the University of London,

The Council of the Victoria University,

The Senate of the University of Wales ; and

'(c) Subject to the provisions of this Act as to first elections—

Two persons elected by the registered teachers engaged otherwise than in public elementary schools ;

Two persons elected by the registered teachers engaged in public elementary schools ;

Two persons elected by the registered teachers generally.

'Women shall be qualified to be members of the Council.

'The term of office of a member of the Council shall be five years ; but a retiring member shall be capable of reappointment or re-election.'

The duties of the council are to

'make and keep a correct register of teachers in England and Wales, and to make rules consistent with this Act for admission to the register.

(1) Except as provided by this Act, a person shall not be admitted to the register unless he possesses—

'(a) A degree or certificate of general attainments which is granted by some university or other body recognized for that purpose by the Council, and is accepted as satisfactory by the Council ; and

'(b) A certificate or diploma of adequate knowledge of the theory and practice of education and of practical efficiency in teaching, which is granted by some university or other body recognized for that purpose by the Council.'

(2) Admission to the register shall be offered on the same terms to all teachers in whatever class or kind of educational institution they may be engaged or seeking engagement, and persons engaged in private tuition shall be entitled to the same privileges in respect of registration as persons engaged in schools.

(3) The Council shall not be bound to register a teacher unless satisfied of his good moral character.

(4) The Council shall not themselves hold examinations for the purpose of determining the qualifications of persons for admission to the register.

(5) The Council may in exceptional cases, and with the approval

of the Education Department, admit to the register any person whose name ought, in the opinion of the Council, to be placed on the register, but who is unable to produce the qualifications required for admission thereto.

The Secondary Education Bill prepared by the Head Masters' Conference differs from the Government proposals in that it makes by statute an Advisory Council of forty-six persons, who are to be made a Body Corporate, and so to a considerable extent be independent of Government. This seems to us to be far from safe, for reasons that we have already stated; as the Advisory Council may differ from the Board of Education, and so create an undesirable amount of friction. Besides this it is more sweeping in its transfer of the powers of the Charity Commission to the Board of Education; for it would transfer to that Board the powers and duties of the Charity Commission under the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869 to 1874, and under the Intermediate Education (Wales) Act, 1889; whilst it would press less heavily upon the Science and Art Department, as it would only deprive it of so much of its present duties as appear to the Treasury to relate to Secondary Education. It would also enable Her Majesty by order of Council to transfer to the Board of Education any powers and duties of any Government department which appear to Her Majesty in Council to relate to Secondary Education. It would require that 'the Education Department shall cause a register to be kept of all Secondary Schools subject to inspection under this Act, which after such inspection are for the time being recognized by the Education Department as reaching the standard of efficiency fixed under this section for the type of the school in question.' It would also require the Education Department, with the approval of the Advisory Council, to fix standards of efficiency for the various types of Secondary Schools, and where more than one type of education is provided at any such school, that school may be treated for the purposes of this section as separate schools, according to the various types of education provided. The Education Department is also to keep a register of persons qualified to teach in Secondary Schools, the provisions for which are similar to those contained in the Lord President's Bill. It would, moreover, require that a local authority for Secondary Education should be appointed by every County Council upon lines resembling those laid down in the Government Bill of 1896.

Whilst the Government Bill seeks to inflict no punishment on any school or teacher not complying with the require-

ments of the Bill, the Head Masters' Conference in their Bill would order that on summary conviction a fine of 50*l.* shall be inflicted on 'a person officially connected with a Secondary School calling or describing the school as a registered Secondary School, or in any other manner representing the school to be a registered Secondary School, if the school is not entered on the school register'; or upon a person who 'shall call or describe himself as a registered secondary teacher, or in any other manner represent himself to be a registered secondary teacher,' when his name is not entered on the teachers' register.

The contentious parts of the question are immediately raised when we begin to consider the nature and powers of the local authority, its power of raising money by rate or otherwise, the provisions for religious teaching which it would be compelled to observe; its power of limiting the opening of new schools. The present Government Bill for constituting a Board of Education avoids all these questions; but at the same time it provides the foundations of a system which will compel the consideration of them. Against this foundation we have nothing to say in serious opposition. There are, of course, points of detail which will require very serious examination. First and most serious of all we want a definition of Secondary School. At first sight it seems as though nothing would be easier than to lay down a definition, but when the attempt is seriously made, it is found to be surrounded with difficulties. Then a point raised in the Head Masters' Bill, and not referred to in the other, is the fact that there are various kinds of education which may fairly claim to be regarded as secondary. Some years since no education would have been thought worthy of the name that did not include the study of Latin and Greek. At the present day it would not be easy to exclude from the name any schools that taught subjects for which degrees in honours could be won at Oxford or Cambridge, or any other university recognized by the Bill by having its representative upon the consultative council. We must, therefore, have a definition of Secondary Education that will include at least such subjects as have been just named. Non-efficient elementary schools have been to a great extent suppressed by the law which compels children to attend school; as those present in schools not recognised by the Education authority are regarded as not attending school, and their parents are consequently liable to fine and imprisonment. Sooner or later we shall no doubt have regulations that will limit the power of opening a school

or of
in th
it. I
ment
exter
sider
gradu
desir
good
made
some
of th
schoo
samp
that t
to del
term
pleas
Boar
next
Act
we ha
gistra
W
somet
be giv
would
as fut
the ch
some
out, as
upon
look f
Fi
Are w
upon
of uph
believ
a certa
istic to
is the
system
with t
with t
absolu
VOL

or of teaching in it, and possibly the severe penalty proposed in the Head Masters' Bill may be adopted, or something like it. But it seems to us judicious on the part of the Government to commence with a system which is to a considerable extent voluntary, which, if wisely worked, must have a considerable influence upon popular opinion, and which can gradually assume a more compulsory position as it is found desirable. It is a great thing to carry so far as possible the good will of those engaged in the profession with the proposals made. It is impossible for them not to bear hardly upon some of those who will be affected by them, and in the Return of the pupils in public and private, secondary and other schools, published by the Education Department, we have samples of what must be expected. Recognizing as we do that the time has come when it is most undesirable any longer to delay legislative measures for bringing into order the intermediate education of the country, we welcome with pleasure the proposals of the Government contained in the Board of Education Bill, and heartily wish that during the next session of Parliament it may convert this Bill into an Act with a few of the kind of amendments to which we have called attention. With regard to the Teachers' Registration Bill we shall have something more to say.

While saying this, we feel it incumbent upon us to add something concerning the further information which ought to be given of the future legislation that we may expect. It would be undesirable to seek to bind Government too closely, as future action must depend to a considerable extent upon the character of the information they obtain. But there are some broad points of principle on which they ought to speak out, as the amount of support they may expect must depend upon the character of the plans to which they may bid us look forward.

First and foremost among these is the religious question. Are we to have our system of secondary education based upon the principle of religious liberty? or upon the principle of upholding a nondescript religion in which no one really believes, but which has the recommendation in the eyes of a certain political and quasi-religious party of being antagonistic to the interests of the Church of England? This last is the principle on which our present elementary education system is largely based; and no impartial person, conversant with the subject, can doubt that it has seriously interfered with the improvement of our educational system, while it is absolutely inconsistent with real religious liberty. On the

one hand, experience shows that those who uphold the School Board system are bent on making it universal, and to effect this are ever advocating costly additions to the expenditure on elementary schools, and an excessive increase in the number of schools under their control in the hope of crushing voluntary schools out of existence; while the supporters of voluntary schools, pressed down by School Board rates in addition to subscriptions for the maintenance of their own schools, are compelled to oppose what will involve additional outlay, unless provision is made for furnishing the money that will be needed out of the public exchequer. So long as this state of things exists it is impossible for our system of elementary education to be satisfactory; while it is ridiculous for us to talk about liberty of conscience in England, when we allow that plea to avail for persons who object to regulations designed to diminish if not to stamp out an offensive disease, while we refuse to allow the plea to parents who object to the religious teaching provided for their children in schools to which they are compelled by law to send them, and to ratepayers who must subject themselves to the restraint of their goods and imprisonment if they refuse to pay the sums levied for the maintenance of schools to which they conscientiously object. After the passing of the recent Vaccination Act we feel that at no distant time this gross anomaly must be rectified; and once let the law ordain that a man's education rate shall only be applied to the maintenance of schools of whose religious principles he can approve, we shall have a united effort to do whatever can be done to make our educational system thoroughly efficient, but until this liberty of conscience is allowed, friction and opposition must be expected, and will probably at no distant time be seriously increased by those who feel aggrieved by the present system uniting in a refusal to pay their education rate.

It is, of course, impossible to introduce any provision of this kind into a Secondary Education Bill. But if it should be found, as no doubt it will be found, that considerable additions will have to be made in the number of secondary schools, why should not a similar plan be adopted to that which was found very useful when the nation began to take an interest in the education of the masses of the people, and in the provision of elementary schools? Grants towards the erection of such schools were at first given by the Treasury, and afterwards by the Education Department, and subsequently indirectly or directly towards their maintenance. With regard to the supply of secondary schools: let the

Centr
mine
a def
shoul
woul
of sch
ficient
whate
willing
years-
or sch
that c
time th
to erect
guaran
upon,
helped
gradua
hood v
school
assista
all par
plying
educati
with th
it wou
school
educati
spectin
be allo
attemp
of the
possible

If so
that all
be read
the right
might f
local au
event o
standar
supersec
place.

Such
the loca

Central Authority proposed by the Government first determine what new schools are needed. Let them then lay down a definition of secondary education, and if this definition should include, as it ought to do, a variety in the schools that would deserve that designation, let them set forth the kind of school required in each locality where the supply is insufficient; and then let it be understood that the local authority, whatever it may then have been decided that it shall be, is willing to make a grant of so much per annum for a number of years—say three—towards the maintenance of such a school or schools as may be wanted in the most suitable premises that can be procured on the condition that at the end of the time those responsible for the school shall make a serious effort to erect suitable buildings, towards the cost of which themselves guarantee to raise not less than such a sum as shall be agreed upon, whilst upon their doing this they will be substantially helped by the local authority. In this way scholars would be gradually gathered in, the probable wants of the neighbourhood would be accurately gauged, the extent to which the school would be able to maintain itself without external assistance would have a chance of being fairly measured; all parties in the State would have an equal chance of supplying what is required, and the cost of furnishing secondary education for the neighbourhood would have been provided with the least possible outlay. To make such a plan succeed it would be necessary that no State and rate supported school professing to be elementary should give secondary education. It would, moreover, require that an appeal respecting the right to provide the secondary schools should be allowed to the central authority, in order that any attempts at jobbing or giving undue preference on the part of the local authority may be rendered difficult, if not impossible.

If some such plan as this was adopted we do not doubt that all the secondary schools that would be needed would be readily supplied. It would, of course, be desirable that the right of inspection should be insisted upon, and a clause might fairly be introduced into the agreement made by the local authority with the voluntary undertakers that in the event of their failing to keep up the school to a required standard, the local authority should have the power of superseding the managers and of appointing others in their place.

Such a plan would have the further advantage of making the local authority free from the responsibility of the direct

D D 2

management of the schools. We have seen the evils resulting from a different course in the case of the Board schools. Members of the Board owe their election in many instances to the teachers of the schools of which by being members of the School Board they become managers, and as a consequence the ratepayers must expect to be more heavily mulcted, in order that members of the School Board who owe their election to the teachers may show their gratitude to those friends who have assisted them.

While we mention the plan proposed above, we do not mean that only one secondary school should be supplied for each neighbourhood when the present supply of secondary education is insufficient. Believing, as we do, that the most important part of all education is the inculcation of good moral and religious principles on which character is founded, we hold that there should be within the reach of all parents schools of which they can approve. We recognize that the Nonconformist, the Roman Catholic, and the Jew, have as much right to have their children educated in their own religious principles as members of the Church of England. We have accepted the principle of religious liberty, and we desire to see it impartially carried out in practice. But this does not require separate educational establishments in every neighbourhood. Boarding schools must play a considerable part in meeting varied wants; the cost of travelling a few miles further is not a matter for consideration, and it would not need much management to overcome this difficulty. And as variety of religious belief will have to be taken into account, so also, to some extent, will social position, and that to an extent which may surprise some people.

We are glad to find that the Bill of the Head-masters' Conference insists upon this principle, and it is probably owing to some extent to this that it has secured the assent of the members whose names stand on the back of the Bill, and who represent such varied religious opinions. This clause (14) runs thus:

'The Local Secondary Education Authority, for the purpose of aiding Secondary Education in their county, may, out of the funds at their disposal for the purpose of this Act, make such grants to Secondary Schools in their district as they think fit on such general conditions as may be approved by the Education Department, but shall not make any grant to a Secondary School conducted for private profit except with the consent of the Education Department.'

'The Local Secondary Education Authority may out of the funds at their disposal for the purpose of this Act, besides giving grants to Secondary Schools, assist Secondary Education in their county by

the giving
to them

'A
provid
make
nexion

TH
to insp
tary a

W
Govern
with i
the C
descri

In

tion o

there

licensi

should

has fo

partm

in ele

in his

tion is

tution

of tea

to be

time t

provis

Counc

duties

a Cou

for suc

be diff

tion o

mainta

obtain

claim

provis

Th

the pu

tives o

Trades

should

selecte

the giving of scholarships, or generally by such other means as appear to them expedient.

'A Local Secondary Education Authority shall not themselves provide or have the management of any Secondary School, but may make any application necessary for a scheme or otherwise in connexion with the provision or management of such a school.'

The same Bill proposes that inspectors shall be appointed to inspect all recognised secondary schools as to their sanitary as well as their educational arrangements.

We turn now from considering the provisions of the Government Board of Education Bill and matters connected with it, to the other Bill introduced by the Lord President of the Council, the most important provisions of which we described at the commencement of this article.

In speaking of this Bill, described as one for the Registration of Teachers, we must say that we can see no reason why there should be an independent body to undertake the licensing of teachers, so that the Education Department should lose control over that most important duty. No one has found fault with the manner in which the Education Department has exercised this duty with respect to the teachers in elementary schools; and as the Lord President informs us in his speech in the House of Lords that the Board of Education is in some important respects to resemble in its constitution the Board of Trade, we do not see why the registration of teachers should not form one of the duties for which it is to be responsible, and which it may delegate from time to time to suitable persons. Neither do we see the need for the provision in the introductory clause that authorises the Council 'to acquire and hold land for the purpose of their duties without licence in mortmain.' For what purposes can a Council for such a purpose require land, and apparently for such a possible amount that a licence in mortmain might be difficult to obtain? Does the proposal conceal the intention of this Council developing into a body erecting and maintaining secondary schools, for which it is desirable to obtain this statutory power before their future plans are proclaimed? Anyhow, we think it most desirable that this provision should be expunged.

Then with regard to the Council, it is much too large for the purpose, and much too thickly packed with representatives of teachers, who may easily make it a department of a Trades Union of Teachers for all practical purposes. We should have thought that what was needed was a small selected body of competent examiners, who should report to

the Education Department the names of those whom they had examined and approved; and then for that Department to have the power of accepting qualified persons under special conditions as provided by the Bill that the Lord President has introduced. Experience has shown us the avidity with which the National Union of Teachers grasps at power, while their representatives in Parliament are perpetually making speeches that warn us of the risk we shall run if legislative power is given to any body over which they can exert control with respect to any matter that bears upon the interests of their members. Moreover, it must be remembered, if a Board consisting chiefly of teachers has the power of excluding from the profession those who wish to enter it, it is quite possible that in their own interest, so as to make the demand exceed the supply, they may reject many who ought to enter it. The mere fact that such a thing is possible suffices to condemn the proposal, for in a profession about which there is so much controversy it is to be expected that sooner or later whatever objections can be raised will be raised, and while it is easy (comparatively speaking) to frame a scheme at the outset that is not open to possible objections which have been foreseen, it is not so easy to amend them when the evil has been experienced.

When more detailed proposals have been placed before the country, or when those now under review have been discussed in Parliament, we shall probably have more to say on the subject, but for the present our object is to let our readers know as succinctly as possible what is proposed, with such brief criticisms as seem to be required.

ART. VII.—HENRY REEVE'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve, C.B., D.C.L. By JOHN KNOX LAUGHTON, M.A., Honorary Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge; Professor of Modern History in King's College, London. In two volumes. (London, 1898.)

WE are often disposed to question whether biography, in its higher sense of literary portraiture, will not shortly be numbered amongst the lost forms of art. Not that there will not hereafter be in rapid succession, as there is at the

present
include
and m
allow
underl
combin
fold pl
tation.
assigne
the hu
some
tempor
excited
memor
well w
needles
need h
stillbor
all rea
the ma
treatme
further
formed
their t
work s

Tha
quote h
method

'In
task is t
they spr
by whic
elaborat
More es
as Henr
most fe
influenc
counsels
Cabinet
Registra
editor of
firm, liv
keys of
power w
of it; no
(Pref. i.

present day, a lengthened issue of books which claim to be included in this category, but because there is an increasing and manifest tendency to produce such works too rapidly to allow of the discriminating thought, the careful study of underlying and subtle elements of character, the balance and combination of apparently incompatible qualities, the manifold play of light and shade essential to a truthful representation. For this condition of things several causes may be assigned besides the incapacity or indolence of authors. In the hurried days in which we live people are impatient for some account of the notable names among their contemporaries, and publishers are aware that the interest excited even by those who are worthy of more permanent memory soon dies out, and that a belated biography, however well written, is likely to prove sadly unremunerative. It is needless to say that multitudes of Lives appear which never need have been written at all, and which deservedly fall stillborn from the press; and equally needless to add that all really useful and desirable purpose would be fulfilled in the majority of more important instances by far briefer treatment than is the prevailing fashion. What we would further also insist on is the mistaken conception so commonly formed by contemporary biographers of what it is which their task demands: a conception of which Mr. Laughton's work supplies a conspicuous illustration.

That we may do Mr. Laughton no injustice, we will quote his own definition of his aims, and will investigate the method he employs to compass them:

'In the case of a man of letters,' he says, 'the biographer's task is to trace the origin of his writings: the sources from which they sprang, the fancies by which they were inspired, the conditions by which they were directed, the methods by which they were elaborated, the labour, the toil by which they have been produced. More especially does this seem to be the case with a subject such as Henry Reeve, whose biography is here attempted; a man of most fertile and fecund pen, whose writings exercised a profound influence on social and political life, whose judgment and whose counsels had a large but unreported share in the decisions of Cabinets; a man who for upwards of sixty years as Clerk of Appeals, Registrar of the Privy Council, as critic, leader-writer on the *Times*, editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, literary adviser of a great publishing firm, lived—if I may use the expression—with his fingers on the keys of public opinion, directing it, leading it, guiding it with a power which was none the less real because few recognised it or knew of it; none the less vast because he himself was not fully aware of it' (Pref. i. v-vi).

With this programme of Mr. Laughton's we have no reason to find fault. It opens out a most alluring prospect. The influence on public opinion of the Clerk of Appeals and of the Registrar of the Privy Council is indeed amongst the secrets hitherto revealed only to the select few, and we are eager to know its origin and its sphere of action. We are no less eager to have revealed to us the working of a power—only partially understood by him who wielded it—which swayed the decisions of Cabinets and shaped the course of English literature.

Yet, as we proceed in the study of Mr. Laughton's pages we are gradually disillusioned. Mr. Laughton has very seriously exaggerated the extent of Henry Reeve's influence in the world of politics and literature: or at least he does not supply matter for vindicating his estimate in the volumes before us. Mr. Reeve was on terms of close intimacy with Lord Clarendon, and in a less degree with other Whig statesmen, as well as with the leading French politicians, Guizot, Tocqueville, and the Orleanist Princes, so that he was at times a very useful medium of communication on important questions of foreign policy; but we cannot discover that he influenced the action of those in power. He was a constant writer in the *Times*, when it was a powerful factor in European opinion, and his articles doubtless expressed his own convictions formed upon exceptional acquaintance with the questions he discussed; but he wrote to order, in the sense that the policy of the *Times* was controlled and directed by other minds than his. As editor of the *Edinburgh Review* he sat, of course, in a dictator's seat—a pure despotism being the only practicable form of government in the case of an anonymous Review—but he conducted that justly famous and respectable periodical on the lines of pure Whiggism which it has followed from its birth to the present hour. There is no evidence that he was of such original or powerful cast of mind as to sway in any marked degree the thought of his time, and as we proceed we shall find reasons for believing that he not infrequently misappreciated and misunderstood any rising tendencies which ran counter to or were not consonant with his opinions.

We have a further criticism to suggest upon Mr. Laughton's conception of what constitutes biography. If a man's literary productions, and the method by which he has been trained to produce them, are to be the staple of his biography, they should at least be so handled as to present a complete and consistent whole. His gradual advance in study and

exper
correct
step by
the inn
should
phrase
more t
and so
heterog
portrait
extract
from h
whom
ence t
gratefu
and G
materi
graphy
such a
do not
be exp
are no
with u
the her
conceiv
The to
we do
sorrow
we wer
intelle
Th
Mr. L
He wa
and hi
leading
then, a
culturo
Austin
record
but se
the fou
he con
trainin
of stu
Germa

experience, and the consequent growth of his opinions; the correction and ripening of immature judgments; the progress step by step to definite convictions and fixed principles, or the inner conflict which has held his mind in suspense: these should be traced out and revealed to us. The modern cant phrase of the biographer suppressing himself may mean little more than that he puts forth a mass of ill-digested materials, and so Mr. Laughton's volumes remind us rather of the heterogeneous contents of a newspaper than the finished portraiture of a skilful composer. We have abundant extracts from Reeve's diaries, and whole pages of letters from his correspondents. We have the names of those whom he met or entertained at dinner, with occasional reference to the quality of the *cuisine*, and we are unfeignedly grateful for the reproduction of letters written by Tocqueville and Guizot, by Lord Clarendon and Lord Derby; but such materials as are here set before us do not constitute a biography, they hardly supply adequate *mémoires pour servir* for such a purpose. They abound in intrinsic interest, but they do not portray Henry Reeve, and the result is what might be expected under such conditions. Mr. Laughton's pages are not heavy or wearisome: we have read them throughout with unflagging pleasure; but their interest is not centred on the hero. As depicted in these volumes it would be hard to conceive a more absolutely colourless, impassive creature. The touch of nature that makes us all akin is never seen—we do not say it was not existing—even at seasons of deepest sorrow that might well reveal it, so as to make us feel that we were dealing with real flesh and blood, and not with a mere intellectual machine.

The 'origins' of Henry Reeve are rightly held by Mr. Laughton to have largely determined his after career. He was surrounded by literary personages from his cradle, and his family circle belonged to and were intimate with leading members of the Unitarian community, many of whom then, as in after years, were conspicuous for their intellectual culture. The names of Mrs. Barbauld, Miss Edgeworth, the Austins, Martineaus and John Stuart Mill meet us in the record of Henry Reeve's childhood. More than all, when but seven years old he was taken to Geneva, where he laid the foundation of that mastery of the French tongue which he consummated nine years later, after an interval of school training under Dr. Valpy at Norwich. A subsequent term of study at Munich gave him an adequate command of German. At every place of sojourn young Reeve contrived

to form the acquaintance, and in after years to retain the friendship, of the men best worth knowing. It was no ordinary equipment for the battle of life, and very rare in a day when modern languages were utterly disregarded in the curriculum of English education. Few, indeed, were the cultured young Englishmen at the passing of the Reform Bill in 1832 who were really proficient in French and German, and who had the *entrée* to the highest literary society alike in London and Paris, in Geneva and Vienna. Reeve was fully conscious how exceptional were the advantages which he enjoyed. 'When I consider,' he wrote to his friend Mr. Handley (he was then only twenty-three), 'the position in which I stand in Paris and even in London, I tremble to think how I can remain worthy of such high associates, and live up to such great purposes' (i. 62).

The list of acquaintances formed in the year 1834, when Reeve was only in his twenty-second year, fully justifies his mingled pride and apprehension. It includes the Bullers, Romillys, Carlyles, Grotes, Seniors, Sterlings, Hayward, George Lewis, Bellenden Ker, and Mrs. Somerville, in London; and Amédée Prévost, Lamartine, Cousin, Alfred de Vigny, Léon Faucher, Tocqueville, and other distinguished names in Paris, where he was also Thackeray's intimate associate, and the friend of Kenelm Digby. He studied philosophy, art, and Roman law. He went to Paris the next year to investigate the theory and practice of French criminal procedure. Here is a letter describing his life in the French capital, some extracts from which may serve to illustrate his position and the character of his pursuits:

'Yesterday Cousin read a splendid account of his scholastic hero, and digressed into a copious improvisation on the characters of those two philosophic bruisers of Brittany, Peter Abélard and René Descartes . . . Kemble gave me a letter to his friend Kenelm Digby. At his house I made the acquaintance of M. Rio, a man whom I have long esteemed for his works, and who knows Schelling and Görres well. Another ward has been opened in the strange Panopticon of which I find myself the central point.

'I have four windows to my cell. From the first I descry the populace of Paris, disguised in ribald masks, drunk with the lusts and follies of the closing carnival, laughing without mirth, swearing without a knowledge or a faith of that by which they swear, intemperate without enthusiasm, fickle without hope.

'From the second I discover a more melancholy scene—the prisons of Paris, the death-beds of the poor, the idiot, and the maniac. I have descended into the dungeon of the assassin, into the cell of the galley-slave; and if the empty hearts and dead souls of the

nation r
reckless
horror.

'The
from whi
like plan
glowing
the past
high prog
Vigny, w
passionat
Wailly, h
Descham
believe h
this conv
ness is t
Ballanch
time I se

'My
cherish, i
and Chris
Catholics
congregat
than I co
nothing c
where I c

Rem
here qu
friends i
lounger
Faubour
made hi
time.
and cult
hurried
Mrs. Au
acquaint
catch at
in his ca
met the
good of
with ope
indebted
'With a l

Ther
followed
He was

nation repelled me with dismay, the unmixed ferocity, the entire recklessness of the criminals of France has overwhelmed me with horror. . . .

'The third aperture, if I may continue my metaphor, is the one from which I discover the groups of good and great men, who grow like plants rich in their own vegetation on the borders of the still glowing crater. With these men I mingle, with them I converse of the past and of the future, and by their backward intuitions and high prognostications, I console myself for the hideous present . . . De Vigny, with his quiet and elegant sensibility; Barbier, with his compassionate philosophy mixed with so rare a power of rebuke; De Wailly, his most intimate friend, the translator of 'Hamlet'; Antony Deschamps, the translator of Dante, whose only madness is to believe himself mad, and who actually lives in a madhouse under this conviction; the stately and benevolent Lamartine, whose madness is to believe himself a statesman . . . lastly, the excellent Ballanche, whom I see very frequently, and whom I like better every time I see him. . . .

'My last look-out turns to the Catholic and untainted few who cherish, in their learned leisure, the traditions of aristocracy, monarchy and Christianity. To these Rio and Digby belong, and the English Catholics in Paris and a few of the most eloquent disciples of that congregation. In this calm society, I have found more reflection than I could have hoped to find in France; but I have seen little or nothing of the gaiety of the Court, where I will not, or the crowds where I cannot, go' (i. 44, 45).

Remarkable as is the variety and eminence of the names here quoted, it by no means exhausts the list of Reeve's friends in Paris; but this youth of twenty-two was no idle loungee at the *soirées* of statesmen and in the *salons* of the Faubourg St. Germain. He worked indefatigably, and so made himself a worthy associate of the leading spirits of his time. He had in truth a perfect genius for society, and cultivated it as a profession or an art. From Paris he hurried back to England on a suggestion from his aunt, Mrs. Austin, of an introduction to Lord Lansdowne. 'The acquaintance,' he writes, 'is too important for me not to catch at it;' and the intimacy thus formed was a turning point in his career. At Lansdowne House and at Bowood, Reeve met the foremost men of the day, and through the *marquis's* good offices the British Embassy at Paris welcomed him with open arms. To the same generous patronage he was indebted for his Clerkship of Appeals to the Privy Council; 'with a handsome salary and all sorts of consideration.'

There is little that need detain us in the two years which followed Reeve's appointment to the Privy Council clerkship. He was getting initiated in the routine of his office, the

principal duty of which was to learn the nature of the appeals as they came on for hearing, and to summon the judges most competent to deal with each case in its turn. A passing reference to the Queen's coronation, when Reeve acted as one of the Earl Marshal's men, and stood behind the throne with the ladies of honour; a lament over the abolition of franks and the democratic tendency of the new penny postage; a detailed account of the strange hoax by which Lord Brougham imposed on society the false news of his death; the trial of the Chartists, and the Queen's declaration of her intended marriage, give us passing glimpses of what is now remote history. Sometimes a single line hits off very happily a characteristic portrait: Landor is as proud of being read by nobody as Bulwer is of being the most popular of authors; Lord John Russell needs the warmth of a country house to thaw his icy manners; Bulwer, though deaf, can hear the solitary hiss amidst the thousand plaudits—so much talent with so little greatness; so much success and so little happiness. Sydney Smith said Macaulay was 'a book in breeches,' which so tickled the Queen's fancy that she could not see him without bursting into fits of laughter. France never waits for the return of a courier from Constantinople, and the reply to a despatch rarely finds the minister who sent it in office.

The year 1840 brought Reeve into closer connexion with Tocqueville and Guizot, through his translation of the *Democracy in America*, and the *Washington* of the great French diplomatist. For Tocqueville's work Reeve had unfeigned admiration, and to him the high credit belongs of introducing it to the English public.

'I am honoured,' he writes to the illustrious author, 'by being in a position to be the first to express to you a sentiment which will soon be shared by all the thinkers of the world. The chapters on the sources of poetry, the melancholy of democratic nations, and their public works, I find particularly striking; it is perhaps the only modern book I have seen in which there is not a word to be cut out—that is, with very few exceptions. . . . What will your democratic readers say of your book? What will France say of it? France so seldom named and so constantly portrayed? Does the world contain a more melancholy picture than that which you draw of a people having all the elements of democratic decadence, without the spirit of order, association, and religion which has preserved (will it always do so?) the American Republics? There is too much feeling in your words for it to be imagined that the picture is imaginary' (i. 114).

About the same time Reeve's relations with Guizot were concerned with a question of vast public interest, which

illustration of the action had a minable French pendency ton w integr into d It mus fidenti and w be dec the en the Fr that R seded.

'From Greville taken; as to the policy and ton's opinion superior

Of course had his 'the in

Yet crisis, the state of being the them, a foremost moral firm much the as the p seen in cal life the imp serve to under th than hal

'Tou my visit

illustrates the high confidence placed in him by some members of the Cabinet, and the limits within which his sphere of action was inevitably confined. A serious misunderstanding had arisen between France and this country over that interminable subject of contention, the Eastern question. The French were disposed to establish Mehemet Ali as an independent sovereign under their suzerainty, and Lord Palmerston was yet more strongly determined to uphold the integrity of the Sultan's dominions. It is needless to enter into details of what was a long and complicated negotiation. It must suffice to say that Reeve went to Paris on a confidential mission, which was protracted for about two months, and was conducted on the supposition that the dispute would be decided by the diplomats of France and England, when the energy of Lord Palmerston and the fall of Acre obliged the French Government to yield. We can easily understand that Reeve felt some chagrin at finding all his labour superseded.

'From all that has now been said and published'—he writes to Mr. Greville—'it results that I, for one, have been in great part mistaken; mistaken as to the danger of Russian interference, mistaken as to the result of the operations in Syria, and mistaken as to the real policy and feeling of France. Was I altogether wrong? Have Palmerston's opinions been justified by an extraordinary good fortune, or by superior knowledge? It is difficult to decide' (i. 140).

Of course Palmerston had the superior knowledge, and Reeve had his first lesson—by which he did not fail to profit—in 'the influence of sea-power.'

Yet, however greatly Reeve was mistaken in this special crisis, there were few Englishmen so well acquainted with the state of France, and his impressions are worthy of notice as being those of a qualified expert. It is interesting to note them, as they show the gradual decline of what was once the foremost European power, and to mark how the relaxation of moral fibre is the secret of national decay. That it is not so much the form of government which is of the first importance, as the principles by which the ruling powers are actuated, is seen in the description given in these pages of French political life under the monarchical *régime* of Louis Philippe and the imperial despotism of Louis Napoleon, which might serve *totidem verbis* for the condition of things which prevails under the existing republic. In the spring of 1841—more than half a century ago—Reeve writes of France as follows:

'Tout le monde m'a comblé de bontés. . . . Yet upon the whole my visit leaves a most melancholy impression. The dissolution of

parties, the rancour of enmities, the absence of political convictions or of courage to avow them, the excess of luxury, and the violence of a false excitement appear to me to augur nothing but the worst for the country. No man is respected. No Government is permanent. And with all my liking for the people, there is an absence of truth and uprightness which convinces me that no serious or solid relation can ever unite the policy of England with that of France. The avenues to power are choked with adventurers struggling for the shattered prize. The accursed past throws its shame and terror over the future, and there is nothing great left in the nation but its splendid vices and defects. Tocqueville himself says that, as nothing remains to them but their national pride, that being shaken, they must fall below the average level of mankind' (i. 145).

It was at this period that Reeve became a constant contributor to the *Times*, which then exerted great influence in European politics. His biographer maintains that he might have become distinguished as a writer on philosophy and history if the need for securing an immediate increase of income had not led him to engage in journalism. All such speculations are idle, or at least only serve to excite a passing regret that talents which might have permanently enriched English literature should have been diverted to the discussion of matters of ephemeral, although for the moment of urgent, importance. The commercial treaty between France and Belgium, the visit to England of the Duc de Bordeaux, the Tahiti incident, the Maynooth Grant, rank now only as exploded fireworks, and the more far-reaching controversies which raged around the repeal of the Corn Laws are barely noticed in Reeve's journal. Two questions of the day are more fully treated—the Spanish marriages and the Irish famine and discontent.

No incident in M. Guizot's political career so lowered him in the estimation of this country as his conduct with regard to the Spanish marriages. Among contemporary French statesmen he held the foremost place for high personal character and as a sincere admirer and friend of England. He was well known as an historian of eminent rank. He had been ambassador at the Court of St. James's. In the mutual relations of the French and English cabinets it was assumed that he might be relied on to deal cordially and candidly in questions on which difference of interest and of policy might be unavoidable. Already the matter of the Spanish marriages had been the subject of anxious negotiation, and terms had been agreed on which the English Court had scrupulously upheld, despite the urgent appeals of Queen Isabella, who was being sacrificed to French interested importunity, when

it was
Philip
on co
pact.
intrica
duplic
and c
How
seen i
ber 19

'Y
are at
ficklen
sion an
believe
upright
which
not ha
attacke
posed
occurre
struggle
the twi
said, b
exact c
'I
much
and hu
change
friends
cular q
ment a
their o
to the
the pas
unders
publicl
am now

Th
Minist
Englis
minist
while
out th
the en
through
able fa

it was suddenly announced that a younger son of Louis Philippe, the Duc de Montpensier, was to marry the Infanta on conditions which grossly violated the international compact. Mr. Laughton affirms that fuller knowledge of this intricate business does clear Guizot from the charges of duplicity and deceit, which at the time were generally believed, and excited throughout England unbounded indignation. How deeply the French minister felt these imputations is seen in the following letter to Reeve under date November 19, 1847 :

'Your country, or I should rather say some of your countrymen, are at present giving one more example of the degree to which fickleness, blind credulity, and ingratitude may be carried by passion and personal feeling. For the last six years England has fully believed in my sincere attachment to the *entente cordiale*, and in the uprightness and integrity of my character. A question arises in which I, a Frenchman, have thought and acted in a way that does not happen to suit England, and in a moment I am not only attacked, which is quite right and natural, but I am no longer supposed to have any integrity, uprightness, or sincerity. All that has occurred during six years, all that I have said and done, all the struggles I have maintained—it all disappears like a puff of wind. In the twinkling of an eye, your people forget all that they have thought, said, believed, written, published ; and they think, say, and write, the exact opposite.

'I have lived too long to be astonished at this ; but I have too much esteem and real friendship for your country not to be grieved and hurt by it. I shall not be guilty of the same fault. I shall not change my feelings and language towards England and my English friends because I find myself at variance with them on some particular question. I have still so much confidence in the sound judgment and integrity of the English people, that I count upon finding their opinion of me the same as it was, as soon as the papers relating to the Spanish marriages have been issued, and the facts—which for the past three months have been ignored, misrepresented, and misunderstood in so strange and incredible a manner—have been publicly discussed. I await that day with perfect tranquillity, and am now as friendly to your country as ever I was' (i. 181, 182).

The triumph, however, of Louis Philippe and his Prime Minister was but short-lived. Already Lord Normanby, the English ambassador at Paris, was foretelling the fall of the ministry, which was only upheld by the support of the king ; while the country was teeming with discontent, which broke out the following year in open revolution. Reeve noted at the end of his diary for 1847 : 'Remarkable depression throughout society ; general illness ; great mortality ; innumerable failures ; funds down to 76 ; want of money ; no society

at all.' A curious presage of the storm which levelled so many Continental thrones and spread over Ireland the blight of famine, misery, and ruin.

These events of home and foreign politics supplied abundant matter for anxious treatment in the columns of the *Times*, to which Reeve was now contributing not infrequently four or five leaders weekly. Amid the sorrow caused by his wife's death, to whom he was deeply attached, and with whom he was only allowed one brief year of wedded happiness, he worked on indefatigably. Mr. Laughton tells us that for fifteen years the payments made to Reeve by the paper averaged close on 1,000*l.* a year, and if the work was heavy and exhausting, it must have been full of the keenest interest. Reeve enjoyed unusual sources of information besides that supplied him in the *Times* office. He was not only the intimate friend of Guizot and Tocqueville, but constant correspondence with Bunsen and Circourt and De Broglie and Saint-Hilaire, kept him *au courant* with European politics. His position on the staff of the leading journal was well known to the foremost Liberal statesman. With Lord Clarendon he was on terms of the most confidential intimacy, and letters from Lords Granville, Brougham, Westbury, and others abound. Later on he was a frequent correspondent with the Orleans princes, and a frequent visitor at their houses. In such a position Reeve naturally became the channel of communication through which those in power sought to inform or to modify the policy of the *Times*.

One occasion for remonstrance was, in the judgment of Lord Clarendon, afforded by the tone adopted in the leading journal towards Louis Napoleon. No words could be too strong in which to condemn the means by which Louis Napoleon had seized upon the government or the cruelties he inflicted on those who withstood his usurpation; but Lord Clarendon thought it impolitic and dangerous to continue the attack after his acceptance by France; more especially since the condition of our navy and coast defences left us practically helpless in the event of an invasion. The subject is of more than passing interest, and suggests lessons which Englishmen would do well to ponder under the circumstances of our own times, and we therefore make no apology for quoting at some length Lord Clarendon's remonstrance, as well as the terms in which Reeve expounded his own views of the responsibility of journalists:

'A casual despotism founded on a popular delusion is the most accurate description that can be given of the present state of things

in France
no permi
able mis
but I e
Napoleo
who stri
had goo
him, bu
the stron
was a du
same at
perhaps
more, I
or by E
permitted
Louis N
army, an
to any e
to persis
dearly;
of nation
best atta

The
consider
our own
influenc
the defe
the dep
position
rate the
press in
and in r
endeavo
of the r
singular
how acc
countryr

'The
the liberty
their duti
find out t
to them s
inform, as
down the
nical, app
particular
independe
forgotten

in France ; and though I agree with you that such power can take no permanent root, yet I fear it may last long enough to do irreparable mischief. . . . The attitude of society may be dignified now, but I expect there will soon be deserters enough to save Louis Napoleon from isolation ; and the taste for grouping round the man who strikes and pays will increase. . . . I have no doubt the *Times* has had good and sufficient reasons for the course taken with respect to him, but I own that to me they are not apparent. To denounce in the strongest terms such acts as Louis Napoleon committed, at first was a duty on the part of the English press. Occasionally to do the same at subsequent periods of his two months' career, was likewise, perhaps, necessary ; but to go on battering at him every day was more, I think, than was required, either by public opinion at home or by English interests abroad. How far the *Times* is now read or permitted to circulate in France I don't know ; but I do know that Louis Napoleon reads it. . . . If we were invulnerable, and had an army, and navy, and rock-defended shores, we might thunder away to any extent ; but in our present helpless state, it seems to me that to persist in irritating France is a luxury for which we may pay dearly ; every newspaper, at the same time, overflowing with proofs of national panic, and the most *naïf* indications of where we can be best attacked and how most easily conquered' (i. 257-8).

The question which Lord Clarendon thus raised is one of considerable intricacy, but with the national convictions of our own day it seems strange that a Cabinet Minister of great influence should have been content to write so calmly about the defenceless condition of his fatherland. In estimating the depth to which England had then sunk, and the high position she now occupies in the world, it is difficult to overrate the service done by the *Times* and other members of the press in promoting a healthier condition of public opinion and in raising a higher standard of national responsibility and endeavour. The letter in which Reeve explained his views of the responsibility of journalists is, in our judgment, of singular merit, and the course of subsequent events showed how accurately Reeve had gauged the mind and spirit of his countrymen :

'The responsibility,' he wrote, 'of journalists is in proportion to the liberty they enjoy. No moral obligation can be graver. But their duties are not the same, I think, as those of statesmen. To find out the true state of facts, to report them with fidelity, to apply to them strict and fixed principles of justice, humanity, and law, to inform, as far as possible, the very conscience of nations and to call down the judgment of the world on what is false, or base, or tyrannical, appear to me to be the first duties of those who write. In this particular case, I further see advantage from the course of a fair and independent judgment on these affairs. It will not perhaps be forgotten by France, when her press recovers its voice, and her real

leaders their power, that the public opinion of England protested with indignation against the violence done to her neighbour ; and as I believe this eclipse of liberty in France to be ephemeral as it is violent, it would be a permanent source of resentment abroad if this country had not expressed what every free people must feel on such an occasion. Nor is it in my opinion useless or unnecessary to keep alive in England a strong feeling on this subject. This nation is a good deal enervated by a long peace, by easy habits of intercourse, by peace societies and false economy. To surmount the dangerous consequences of such a state, the Government will require the support of public opinion, and that can only be obtained by convincing our countrymen of the truth that we have now a dangerous and faithless neighbour. Happen what may, there is nothing so important as to sustain a tone of moral independence and a clear judgment among the people of England, who will grudge no sacrifices if they are convinced that the principles they cherish are even indirectly threatened from abroad' (i. 251).

The true character of Louis Napoleon was as yet an enigma which sorely puzzled European publicists and statesmen. His earlier adventures had not been calculated to win a high opinion of his ability, and he was surrounded at the Tuileries by men of inferior knowledge and capacity, who gave small promise of being able to uphold his power. Yet it was of the first importance to know what manner of man he was into whose keeping the destinies of European peace or war had been so strangely and unexpectedly committed ; what degree of support he could command from the powerful nation whose voice had confirmed him in the throne he had usurped ; what estimate was formed of him by the cultured classes whose persistent antagonism might weaken, even if it could not overthrow, him. On all these matters Reeve had invaluable instruction from Guizot, whose numerous letters give an accurate picture of French thought and feeling from the practical view of a statesman and the calm judgment of a philosopher. We have not space for many tempting passages. His miniature portrait of the Emperor is singularly faithful.

'In himself he is a small chaos : imperialist and revolutionist, absolutist and socialist, with aristocratic tastes and democratic ideas, with a reverence for tradition and a passion for enterprise, the desire of order and a contempt for equity, in action most rash, yet cold, taciturn, and obstinate. Until now these inconsistent traits have been bridled by the obstacles which he met with, and the struggles he had to maintain with rival powers. But now, there are no more obstacles, no more rivals ; he stands alone, absolutely alone, absolutely master. In outward appearance he is the same as before—cold, silent, quiet, and gentle ; but inwardly he is intoxicated by

his triumphant bayonet arguments and can and fan the blind

Ree sequen charge his Jou action i which l pardon had ris sincere unfetter of forei been bo sphere i convicti which s became without views of tions un which w

The to which contribu these vo notice. they are pages, a tempora in litera but vai literatur and whic the vene in the w independ proffered at the sa burgh's r was sign

his triumph, the 7,500,000 votes that elected him, and the 400,000 bayonets which surround him. He considers these unanswerable as arguments, irresistible as force; he is thus led to believe that he may and can do what he pleases, and plunges headlong into the frenzies and fancies of absolute power, with the pride of an old despot and the blind confidence of a young mystic' (i. 254).

Reeve's connexion with the *Times* ended in 1855, in consequence of some interference by Dasent, while in temporary charge of the paper, with his articles on foreign policy. In his *Journal* Reeve strongly vindicates his own independent action in the line he had adopted for the fifteen years during which he had contributed to its columns, and he records with pardonable satisfaction that during that period the circulation had risen from 13,000 to 62,000 copies. No doubt he was sincere in asserting that his articles were dictated by his own unfettered free will and were the expression of a great system of foreign policy such as he would have acted on if he had been born to the position of a minister; but the whole atmosphere in which he lived and breathed was charged with Whig convictions, and he was unconsciously inoculated with opinions which so accorded with the bent of his own mind that they became his own. Yet it is impossible to read these volumes without seeing how thoroughly he was saturated with the views of leading Liberal statesmen, and on most critical questions until his death in 1870 it was Lord Clarendon's views which were put forth through the agency of Henry Reeve.

The history of Reeve's editorship of the *Edinburgh Review*, to which he succeeded almost immediately upon ceasing to contribute to the *Times*, although it fills the larger half of these volumes, does not present very many salient points for notice. It is not that the interest of the *Memoirs* flags, but they are even of a more discursive nature than the earlier pages, and are rather a running commentary on the contemporary history of the time than any record of its progress in literature and science. We have studied them carefully but vainly for indications of the vast influence over the literature of his time which Mr. Laughton claims for Reeve and which Mr. Lecky accords him. Of course the editor of the venerable blue-and-yellow organ could not but be a power in the world of letters, and Reeve sturdily upheld his own independence and that of the *Review*, declining at times the proffered help of men in highest authority, and maintaining at the sacrifice of personal friendship the spirit of the *Edinburgh's* motto, *Judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur*. This was signally the case in a paper on Kinglake's *Crimea*, written

by Reeve but inspired by Lord Clarendon, and subsequently in an unfavourable notice of Froude's *Catharine of Aragon*. But some of Reeve's judgments are startling. He spoke very slightly of Emmanuel Deutsch's article on the Talmud in the *Quarterly Review*, and held that the *Life of Pusey* 'laid bare, as nothing else has done, the total weakness and inconsistency of the Tractarians and their absolute disloyalty to the Church of England'!

After such a verdict the reader will be prepared to learn that Reeve's Journal is a complete blank upon the Oxford Movement, which was working before his eyes, but whose significance he entirely failed to comprehend. Nor was he gifted either by capacity or conviction to deal with Church questions. A chapter in the second volume of the *Memoirs* bears the title of 'Church Politics,' but its space of thirty pages contains little beyond the most meagre reference to Gladstone's measure for Irish disestablishment, save a letter from Lord Westbury in the unexpected guise of a Church defender, on the twofold ground—first, that stripping the Irish Church of its property to convert it to secular uses was robbery; and second, that destroying episcopacy in, and the Queen's supremacy over, the Established Church in Ireland was a wanton, unnecessary, and mischievous act. The latter reason betrays singular confusion of thought in one so clear-headed, as though episcopacy could be touched by Act of Parliament: but the concern expressed for the Queen's supremacy was in full harmony with the Erastian views the writer shared with his correspondent. It is only just to add that Reeve appears to have been sincerely attached to the Church's forms of worship, and that he had a distinct abhorrence both of the then somewhat fashionable materialism and of the Darwinian theory, in which he discovered the same fatal tendency.

We cannot reopen the controversy which raged over the publication of the Greville *Memoirs*, which Mr. Laughton defends in somewhat half-hearted fashion. He admits that the Queen was not unnaturally much offended, and that Reeve himself was fully alive to the great responsibility he was undertaking; but he endeavours to defend him from the charge of being influenced by pecuniary motives. The latter point is of small account compared with the wide question whether Greville in his official position was justified in keeping a 'Journal,' and whether Reeve, knowing as he did the disposition of the writer, should have allowed it to see the light. The publication gave birth to many epigrams, all to

the same
Mr. La

It is
Reeve's
advant
would
tained
and sta
or a s
causes
Sir J.
assured
to say
best th
Clanwi
'Lord
'Yes,'
on that
Reeve's
biased
Lord G
as 'alw
taking
Is the
cautious
definite
and I n
This wa
The c
but we
'There
started,
a serious
revoluti
territori
chaos' (f
foretold

the same effect, and all ending with the same rhyme, of which Mr. Laughton gives the following specimen :

'For fifty years he listened at the door,
And heard some secrets, and invented more ;
These he wrote down, and statesmen, queens and kings
Are all degraded into common things.
Though most have passed away, some still remain
To whom such scandal gives a needless pain ;
And though they smile, and say, " 'Tis only Greville,"
They wish him, Reeve, and Longman at the devil.'

It is singular how scanty are the quotable sentences from Reeve's Diary when we recall the very exceptional social advantages he enjoyed. Scores of pages in the aggregate would be filled with the bare names of those whom he entertained or met at dinner, and they include all the wits, writers, and statesmen of the day ; yet we rarely find a single *bon mot* or a sparkling repartee. Occasionally a brief comment causes some surprise. An *Edinburgh Review* dinner, with Sir J. Stephen, Bonamy Price, Mrs. Jameson and Milnes, assuredly included some brilliant talkers, but is noted, 'not, to say the truth, a very exhilarating assembly.' One of the best things given us is the reply of Metternich to Lord Clanwilliam, *à propos* of Guizot's motto—*Via recta brevissima*. 'Lord Clanwilliam said the shortest way was also the best.' 'Yes,' added Metternich, 'and it has also the advantage that on that path you don't meet anybody.' It was natural that Reeve's estimate of statesmen on his own side should be biassed by the degree of intimacy they allowed him, but Lord Granville has perhaps hard measure in being described as 'always waiting upon fortune, but utterly incapable of taking a strong resolution based on principle and conviction.' Is the explanation given in a previous sentence ? 'He is so cautious and reserved that it is impossible to extract any definite opinion or advice from him. I have tried repeatedly, and I never got so much as a hint from him worth repeating.' This was unprincipled indeed !

The *obiter dicta* in Guizot's letters might fill many a page, but we have only space for a small selection from them : 'There is no purely Eastern question ; as soon as one is started, it will become the Western question ; and as soon as a serious question is raised in the West it will become the revolutionary question : the question of social change, of territorial readjustment throughout Europe—the question of chaos' (i. 291). Of the Crimean war and its conclusion he foretold that the verdict of posterity would be, 'Guerre faite

sans raison suffisante de part ni d'autre ; paix faite sans raison suffisante de part ni d'autre' (i. 331). 'The longer I live the more I am convinced that to understand revolutions and revolutionists one must have lived in the midst of them. Seen from afar, they are rearranged and recast at will, to suit or confirm our preconceived ideas of history or art' (i. 343). Macaulay's *History* is 'a brilliant embroidery on strong material. Great qualities are so rare that when I find them I forget the faults' (i. 344). The great historian's opinion on any historical point is worth recording. 'I do not want,' he says, 'political or moral appreciations. What I should like would be a book in which all the events of any importance are related in chronological order. I particularly hold to knowing the correct dates. It is only on this condition that history can be materially known and morally understood' (ii. 155).

It is impossible to reproduce within the limits of a review a tithe of the sparkling passages in the letters of Reeve's distinguished correspondents. The uncertainty which besets even contemporary history is well illustrated in Lord Brougham's forgetfulness of his own exact share in Lord Grey's administration, and his eccentricities appear in the copious and characteristic letters with which he favoured the Clerk of the Council. Lord Westbury, again, is seen in these pages, not only as a brilliant and fascinating correspondent, but as the most indulgent and domestic of fathers, delighting in his family circle and surrounded by a whole swarm of children and grandchildren. What glimpses, too, are given us of the intricate web which is woven in most political combinations ; of the serious misgivings with which the most conspicuous actors on the world's stage are oftentimes constrained to play their parts ; of the mutual distrust existing between members of the same Cabinet behind the mask of unanimity presented to the outer world ; of the organized hypocrisy or the reasonable compromise (as the same transaction is viewed by friend or foe) with which men, nominally all of one party, adopt measures insisted on by their colleagues, but which in their hearts they abhor. With what scorn does Lord Westbury denounce the inclusion of Mr. Bright in the Cabinet of 1880 ! With what despair Lord Ebury refers to Mr. Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule and his alliance 'with Parnell and his ragged regiment. The *Times* is working most patriotically ; but why in the world did it or he not find out earlier what the G.O.M. really was and is ?' (ii. 343). We must do Reeve the justice to note that his political

persp
and,
Reev
which
Lord
omitt
than
ment
sake
descri
the m
O
mater
histor
foreign
densa
allotte
except
Prince
Circou
very
Reeve
no frie
writte
larly i
'Pr
to feel
begins
he cou
on the
to, uph
financi
interest
he can
prophe
suspici
can be
friend
charged
ruin, or
Arnim,
Moltke
to prov
king ca
perfidio
leave ha
but of

perspicacity early discerned Gladstone's dangerous tendencies, and, although he was no admirer of Lord Beaconsfield, Reeve expressed his unqualified disgust at the method in which the electoral campaign of 1880 was won. The late Lord Derby's estimate of Earl Russell is too good to be omitted: 'He was more thoroughly and essentially a partisan than anyone I have known, and sometimes open to the comment that he seemed to consider the universe as existing for the sake of the Whig party' (ii. 374). This recalls Mrs. Poyser's description of the cock who thought that the sun got up in the morning to hear him crow.

Of deeper and more enduring interest is the store of material bearing upon important subjects of contemporary history which fills the copious communications of Reeve's foreign associates. We had marked many passages for condensation or quotation, but we are already at the end of our allotted space, and can only crave room for one extract of exceptional value at the moment when the character of Prince Bismarck is so widely discussed. The writer, M. de Circourt, although unknown to the outer world, was a man of very wide attainments and general culture, and one of Reeve's most intimate allies. The estimate is drawn up by no friendly hand, but it should be remembered that it was written twenty years ago, and it will be seen that it is singularly in accord with the latest appreciations.

'Prince Bismarck, I apprehend, has lived too long. He begins to feel the fickleness of fortune. He has never had any friends; he begins to be burdensome to his associates. I don't know whether he could have managed a Parliament elected after the actual method on the Continent. I am certain that he did not, and never was able to, uphold a consistent and honourable system whatever. He is no financier, no economist; and as he does always act upon the interests of the present hour, without regard to past engagements, he can have with him but those who superstitiously deem him a prophet, or those who choose to *servir à tout prix*. He is rude, suspicious, and vindictive. The only great minister with whom he can be compared, Richelieu, was at least frank and open towards friend and foe. Bismarck has never negotiated with any man, nor charged any man with an important measure, without becoming their ruin, or changed them into implacable enemies—Savigny, Usedom, Arnim, Gortschakoff. The good genius of his country has protected Moltke against his insidious praises and bitter censures. It is easy to prove that, during the late war, all the good advice given to the king came from Moltke; all hurried, or lame, or improvident, or perfidiously cruel measures came from the Chancellor. Why did he leave half of the forts round Paris in the power, not of our army, but of the armed rabble, to which he left the possession of fifteen

hundred field-pieces and three hundred thousand guns, while he disarmed the regulars to the last man? To his calculations we owe the Commune; posterity will hold him responsible for that incalculable calamity, which it was at every hour in his power to avert or to crush instantly' (ii. 268-9).

To the end of his long life Reeve continued to be an energetic worker, nor did his interest slacken in the world of politics. After Mr. Gladstone's submission to Home Rule he joined the Liberal Unionists, and in his eightieth year we find him lamenting the return of the Radicals in 1891 to office if not to power. Of course, as age crept on early friends kept dropping off, and the volume of his correspondence was greatly diminished; but it was not till the month of October 1895, when he was eighty-three, that he ceased to be literary adviser to the Longmans, and probably his last letter was dictated on the business of the Review. He literally died in harness. If his range of knowledge and sympathies were somewhat contracted, he knew thoroughly what he knew, and he was consistently faithful to the principles in which he believed. If he were one of fortune's favourites, and occasionally displayed some of the venial weaknesses of those whom that capricious goddess spoils, there must have been in him sterling qualities which attracted and retained so many precious friendships; and Mr. Lecky tells us he was quick and generous in recognizing rising eminence. On the same authority we learn that 'he looked forward to the end with a perfect and most characteristic calm, without fear and without regret. It was the placid close of a long, dignified, and useful life.'

ART. VIII.—SACERDOTALISM.

1. *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life.* By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (London, 1898.)
2. *The Ministers of Jesus Christ.* A Biblical Study. By the Rev. J. F. LEPINE. (London, 1898.)
3. *The Claims of the Priesthood considered.* By HENRY HARRIS, B.D. Second and Revised Edition. (London, 1898.)

SACERDOTALISM is a favourite word in times of controversy about the Christian Ministry. It is comprehensively

emp
vario
at on
yet c
truth
Sace
and
amon
to co
whic
and
acce
the
they
them
ciple
term
in I
whic
concl
littl
inclu
funda
as a
appo
if the
assur
whic
act i
betw
the s
the S
that
be m
are n
those
appoi
is a
outse
emba

1 C
said :
body,
divine
are ou

employed as a term of condemnation by men who occupy various standpoints of religious belief, who are by no means at one in their views on the Christian Ministry, and who are yet evidently agreed in thinking that there is no element of truth in the word which they use in common. To them Sacerdotalism describes a system which is wholly unscriptural, and therefore not to be tolerated for a moment. We are among those who believe that the word is often loosely used to cover both truth and error: that it is used to include errors which would be, if laid bare, almost universally condemned, and truths which would be, if displayed, almost universally accepted. We venture further to express our conviction that the word is used by many who have never thought how far they are logically carried by their position, who have lost themselves in details without considering fundamental principles, and who have, in fact, thoughtlessly accepted a popular term. We shall find in the books now before us, especially in Dr. Bright's most valuable addresses, many passages which, as warnings or instructions, will lead us to right conclusions on these matters; but we may first of all clear a little ground by drawing attention to some errors generally included under the term Sacerdotalism, and then to the fundamental principles at issue. If Sacerdotalism is defined as a system of ministerial action by men who were not appointed by Christ, or who claim to act apart from Him as if they were not His agents and His instruments, or who assume powers over the children of the divine household which are inconsistent with their position as stewards; or who act in effectual defiance of the unique mediation of Christ between God and man, and who stand between Christ and the sinner to bar the sinner's way instead of bringing him to the Saviour: then we heartily and without reserve confess that we are not Sacerdotalists. But we can go further, and be more explicit in defining our position, and say that we are most thorough Sacerdotalists, if that name be given to those who answer Yes to the plain question, Did Christ appoint any order of ministers in His Church? ¹ This surely is a fundamental and a necessary question. At the very outset it cuts right across the path of all who are about to embark on any inquiry about the Christian Ministry. We

¹ Canon Gore (*Guardian*, November 2, 1898, p. 1699) has recently said: 'The New Testament regards the whole Church as a sacerdotal body, and therefore no doubt the clergy with their special ministry of *divine appointment* as in a special sense sacerdotal.' The italics are ours.

believe that the answer No is in direct opposition to the evidence of the Bible, but it may be well to say that if this answer be given, as it is given by many, no one has any authority to lay down another foundation and say that any special kind of Church organization or government is obligatory upon Christian people. It would, on this hypothesis, require a large measure of self-confidence on the part of anyone who should suggest an arrangement of human contrivance, of mere convenience and expediency for ministerial appointment. It would certainly be more reasonable, and, we may say, more reverent and submissive to the Divine Head of the Church, to hold that as He was not pleased to make provision for any kind of ministers, it is not desirable to have ministers in the Christian Society at all. We are all familiar with many societies of professing Christians who answer No to the great question, who confess readily enough that there is no essential difference between their 'ministers' and themselves, and who yet illogically ask us to treat their 'ministers' as we treat our own, whom we sincerely believe to differ essentially in their ministerial office from laymen. It would probably be a satisfactory way of finding out the real tendency of any work on the Church or the Ministry to ask what answer the writer gives to our fundamental question. Mr. Harris in his discursive essay on 'human ministrations' (chaps. i.-iv.), the 'administration of the Sacraments' (chaps. v.-viii.), and other topics (chaps. ix.-xii.), although himself in Holy Orders, has now come to give the answer No. We wish to speak respectfully of a venerable writer who is now in his eightieth year, who wrote an essay in defence of the priesthood against the theory of Dr. Arnold in 1849, and who now writes in a tone of sincere piety, though from an altered standpoint. But we must speak firmly about his book, and say that he hardly seems to be aware that his argument really carries him to the denial of any ministerial offices in the Church of whatsoever kind. And further, when such a passage as St. Luke xii. 42¹ is not so much as mentioned, we may fairly say that the Scriptural evidence has been insufficiently considered.² Mr. Harris tells us that he was led by a remark of J. B. Mozley to reconsider his earlier position. May we, then, ask him

¹ In Mr. Lepine's reference to this passage 'householder' is a misprint for 'household,' p. 84.

² Dr. Bright is constrained to say that 'it is really surprising' that such 'cardinal texts' as St. Luke xii. 42 and St. Matt. xxiv. 45 'are not discussed by Dr. Hort' (p. 15, note 2).

to
that
mad
it w

1
over
point
just a
There
tive o
by th
have
points
groun
idea o
just a
Mr. H
of St
dispu
passa
who p
that o
the m
68-9).
sense.
that a
High
that v
Huma
refer
the ca
fact th
gating
decide
the au
the m
posing
before
argum
body
Pastor
shoul
Churc
p. 106
the sp
that th
hood,
with r
pp. 11
gation
would
sterial
would
is rep

to reflect upon this passage of the Gospel, in the hope that he will recognize its great significance? We have made notes of many passages in his little book, but it would be unprofitable, except in a footnote,¹ to enter into

¹ On pp. 38-9 he considers 'Take, eat,' and 'Do this,' but passes over the force of 'which is given,' and in saying that 'Do this' plainly points to eating and drinking he seems to forget that the words would just as naturally point to what the disciples had seen our Lord do. There is no sign that Mr. Harris has reflected that the words in the narrative of institution are to be regarded as filled with a higher significance by their adoption into Christianity. On p. 41, in the comment on 'we have an altar,' it should have been observed that the indicative 'we have' points to a present sacrificial act. On p. 42, the argument (called 'good grounds' on p. 84!) that 'bishop' and 'elder' necessarily exclude the idea of priesthood because selected from an exclusively lay source might just as well be used to exclude the idea of pastorship. On p. 43, where Mr. Harris notes that the genuineness of certain passages of the Epistle of St. Clement is disputed by Neander, he omits to say that Neander disputes them on purely internal grounds. On p. 52 it is admitted that passages in St. Justin Martyr plainly assert an offering made by him who presides, but Mr. Harris does not see that this action is *ipso facto* that of a priest, and that *ὁ προεστώς* clearly implies a difference between the man so described and the rest in front of whom he stands (cf. pp. 68-9). On p. 59 'a propitiatory offering' is used not in the proper sense. On pp. 62, 65, Judaizing notions prevent Mr. Harris from seeing that at the Last Supper our Lord was presenting Himself to God as High Priest and devoting Himself as Victim. On p. 64, when it is said that we are invited to partake of the glorified rather than the suffering Humanity of our Lord, it should be added that the invitation has special reference to the virtue of His suffering. On p. 84, in commenting upon the case of Corinthian incest, Mr. Harris misses the significance of the fact that St. Paul makes the Church of Corinth the organ of promulgating, with voluntary adhesion and assent, his own decision—'I have decided' (but see p. 86). On p. 91 Mr. Harris is in confusion between the authority of Scripture (which no one disputes) and decisions upon the meaning of disputed passages; and on p. 92 he is in error in supposing that the Churchly idea requires the prostration of the intellect before ecclesiastical authority. In the whole of this chapter Mr. Harris's argument requires him to deny that our Lord intended to perpetuate a body of teachers or pastors in His Church. On p. 98 a remark on the Pastoral Epistles begs the whole question, and these Epistles alone should have saved Mr. Harris (and, we may add, some modern schools of Church Reformers) from the excesses of ecclesiastical democracy. On p. 106 it is implied that no class of men in the Church is invested with the special function representing Christ, and on p. 107 it is forgotten that the priestly character of all Jews was compatible with a special priesthood, and the inference again is that our Lord has provided His Church with no chartered ministry of any kind, let alone a priesthood. On pp. 114, 120, the ministers of Christ are set forth as agents of the congregation. On pp. 118, 120, 'Moberley' is a misprint. If Mr. Harris would read what Professor Moberly has recently written about Ministerial Priesthood (see the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 91, p. 1) he would not lose sight of the cardinal principle (pp. 124-5) that the ministry is representative of the Church as the eye is the divinely provided repre-

further details, when we question Mr. Harris's fundamental principle. Our answer to the great fundamental question is Yes, and we recognize that that lays upon us the necessity of explaining what we understand our Lord to have appointed, and accepting His arrangement with obedient loyalty. This will lead us to comment upon Mr. Lepine's 'Biblical Study.' But before doing so we will sketch the outline of our positive position.

We infer from St. Luke xii. 42, and we hold it to be unreasonable to deny the inference, that it was our Lord's intention to appoint faithful and wise stewards over the members of His household to give them from Him their portion of meat in due season.¹ We read that He selected twelve men from the company of His disciples, and named them Apostles, and there are many passages in the Bible which show that much importance was attached to their selection. For example, before choosing them our Lord spent the whole night in prayer, and not only are their names repeated four times in the New Testament, and many weighty and honourable sayings of our Lord about them recorded, but we are told that the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb are written in the twelve foundations of the wall of the new Jerusalem. Before His death and after His resurrection our Lord gave much special instruction to them, and when He was about to ascend into heaven He charged the whole company of His disciples, among whom the Apostles are expressly mentioned,² to go into all the world, to make disciples of all nations by baptism, to preach the Gospel to every creature, and to rely upon His gracious promise to be with them always, even unto the end of the world. The Acts of the Apostles and the books of the Epistles contain sufficient samples to show what were the things pertaining to the kingdom of God on which our Lord had given instruction.

representative of the body in seeing. Mr. Harris fails to see that it is necessary in the first instance to settle who appointed the representative. Finally, Mr. Harris refers (p. 82) to his friend 'the Rev. W. Bright,' and we hope that he will read what Dr. Bright has to say about the Ministry in his new volume which stands at the head of our article.

¹ If all Christians are stewards in the sense of the Parables of the Talents and the Pounds, surely also this passage from St. Luke involves a sense in which all are not stewards, for it implies a distinction between the stewards and the household, and describes a position of divinely given authority. As Dr. Bright says, if St. Luke xii. 42 'were a newly discovered text, claiming to be part of a Gospel, not a few would probably reject it at once, as "condemned by its sacerdotalism"' (pp. 48-9).

² But on the theory of 'Apostolic Commission to the whole Christian Society,' see Dr. Bright, pp. 16-17, 257).

The
amon
sion
addi
of S
Holy
Time
tions
guish
T
has e
a lar
versi
grow
the e
New
Nice
plan
and
as a
him.
the
volun
show
than
tion
concl
is a
and l
and i
temp
that
the c
minis
leave
inter
shifts
other
Lepin
hood
pp. 5
sacred
believ
1 2
Soame

The continuation of the Apostolic office was undoubtedly among them. Steps were taken immediately after the Ascension of our Lord to fill the vacant place of Judas Iscariot; additions were made to the Apostolic company in the persons of St. Paul and St. Barnabas by the express command of the Holy Ghost, and at the close of his life St. Paul left St. Timothy at Ephesus and St. Titus in Crete to hold ordinations and to discharge functions which it is hard to distinguish from the work entrusted by our Lord to the Twelve.

The ground just traversed is part of that which Mr. Lepine has endeavoured to cover in his book. His whole design is a large and a good one: namely, to examine, not in a controversial but in a devotional and practical spirit, the rise and growth of the idea, functions, and exercise of Ministry from the earliest intimations in Holy Scripture to the close of the New Testament Canon, and then onwards through the Ante-Nicene literature as far as 325 A.D. This bold and ample plan would clearly tax the best powers of the ripest scholar, and Mr. Lepine will not think us unmindful of his diligence as a student if we say that his subject has been too big for him. He has indeed in the present volume only dealt with the Scriptural evidence, without saying definitely that a volume of the Ante-Nicene period is to follow. But he has shown more powers of industry in the collection of evidence than ability in sifting and interpreting the meaning and relation of his materials, and he too often stops short of the true conclusion to which his witnesses are leading him. But he is a painstaking student of the Bible, if timid and modest, and he does not pin himself to any one aspect of the subject and ignore others, after the manner of Mr. Soames, whose intemperate pamphlet we recently noticed, who is eager to prove that as our Lord discharges a continuing priesthood after the order of Melchisedek, He cannot have appointed any ministerial instruments of His sacerdotal office, and who leaves everything in the New Testament out of sight which interferes with his contention: to say nothing of his desperate shifts to evade the teaching of the Ordinal, the Articles, and other parts of the Prayer Book.¹ We must pass over Mr. Lepine's examination of the rise and establishment of priesthood (p. 7), of which a convenient summary is given on pp. 53-5, only remarking that he follows the order of the sacred books of the Old Testament in the English Bible and believes that it represents 'the order of successive develop-

¹ *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*, by the Rev. W. H. K. Soames, M.A. See the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 93, p. 246.

ment of the several ideas noted,' without entering into 'the chronological order of the records of those books' (p. 10). Part II., on the consummation of Priesthood in Jesus Christ (pp. 59-77), is an excellent extraction of the New Testament evidence on that point, and of course at its conclusion emerges the crucial question of Mr. Lepine's book, 'Was the Priesthood, thus fulfilled by Christ, in any sense or in any part delegated by Him to those whom He sent forth as His ministers, as He had been sent forth by the Father?' (p. 77). Mr. Lepine arranges the passages which answer this question under suitable heads, but his comments upon them are satisfactory in some places, and too vague in others, in some ascribing to the ministers functions which are exercised by all, and in others appearing to suggest that the ministers have no 'character' distinct from the privileges of all the members of the body. For example, it is obvious to remark that the power of effectual prayer is not on any theory confined to the ministers (pp. 82, 85). But we can quote some excellent remarks: such as that our Lord 'does not send forth His Church as an automatic organism independent of Himself, but ever in vital union with, absolute dependence on, and entire subordination to, Himself its Head' (pp. 88-9); that the Apostles were 'divinely appointed to official ministry' (p. 168); that the Apostolate was to be 'maintained and perpetuated in succession as the divine method for the ruling and teaching of Christ's Church, and for the advancement of His kingdom' (p. 209); that this office was to remain until the Lord comes again (p. 226), and that 'as the priesthood of Israel was distinguished from the office of the priesthood, so the ministerial office of the Christian priesthood is distinguished from the universal priesthood of the people of Christ' (p. 173). On the other hand we meet with such a sentence as 'to assert the priestly character of the Church is to assert the priestly character of the ministry in the Church' (p. 172), which might mean that the Christian ministry derives no special character from the Head of the Body. Mr. Lepine's treatment of the New Testament use of *λειτουργίῳ* and cognate words (p. 126), *μυστήριον* (p. 257), the priesthood of the laity (p. 149), the distinctions of office among ministers (p. 175), and the Lord's Supper (p. 235) is marked by the same features that we have indicated—care, satisfactory conclusions reached or nearly reached on the whole, with occasional passages of vagueness. The list of works consulted, the reader must remember, includes, in Mr. Lepine's own words, 'writers representing all shades of belief, opinion, and

critici
than
still ca
advice
to wh
No
self ex
more
benea
we ca
lead u
fact i
Gospo
mann
sacerd
And v
of Go
ledge
primit
when
an O
learn
it was
minist
polem
expre
many
must
has m
of the
ducto

¹ A
on p. v
a Latin
Englis
Eden's
the bod

² A
³ V
wish o
is con
thirty y

⁴ T
Ebioni
p. 260,
say's v
munica
ber 7,

criticism' (Pref. p. v).¹ In laying down the book we can thank Mr. Lepine for all that is excellent in his work, but still can direct him to a more excellent way, if he will take our advice and study the subject further in Dr. Bright's *Aspects*, to which we now turn.

Not that we wish to imply that Dr. Bright devotes himself exclusively to the subject of the Christian ministry any more than to any one of the other great subjects which pass beneath his eye, and which he treats so characteristically that we can think of at least half a dozen Articles which would lead us to place the *Aspects* at the head of each. But the fact is that the history of the primitive Church, like the Gospel story,² very largely consists of a narrative of the manner in which the Head of the Church discharged His sacerdotal functions through divinely chosen instruments. And when Dr. Bright was surveying the structure of the city of God from the commanding eminence of his ripe knowledge; when he was marking well the bulwarks of the primitive Church, and telling the towers thereof; especially when he was surrounded by clergymen who had assembled at an Oxford 'summer meeting,' and who in many cases had learned their earliest lessons in Church history at his lectures, it was natural, nay inevitable that the subject of the Christian ministry should occupy a noticeable, though in no way a polemical, place in this course of 'Addresses.'³ We can only express our regret that we cannot, except in part, touch upon many of the matters to which Dr. Bright refers, and that we must content ourselves with the general observation that he has made an additional purchase imperative to every student of the ante-Nicene Church.⁴ His aim is stated in his introductory paragraphs, to which it is the more necessary to draw

¹ A slight error occurs, 'in' for 'of,' in quoting Bishop Bilson's work, on p. viii. It is correctly quoted on p. 261. It may be well to add that a Latin edition of Bishop Bilson's book was published in 1611. Two English editions were published, one in 1593 and another in 1611. See Eden's edition (Oxford, 1842), preliminary note, p. x. Dr. Bright quotes the book by its Latin title (p. 21).

² As Maurice fully recognized: *The Kingdom of Christ*, ii. 148.

³ We may perhaps suppose that Dr. Bright yielded to some strange wish on the part of his publishers in not using the word 'lectures,' which is connected with such happy memories in his case, the memories of thirty years in the Chair of Ecclesiastical History.

⁴ Though it was not to Dr. Bright's purpose to go into the question of Ebionism, yet see on this the 'Additional Note,' p. 258. The same note, p. 260, refers to an interesting paper in the *Guardian*, on Professor Ramsay's view of the date of 1 St. Peter. The Professor has since communicated a rejoinder to the writer of it. See the *Guardian* for December 7, 1898.

attention because the book is without preface and, what is unusual with Dr. Bright, without a dedication, and because there are but three lines of advertisement, and these only tell us of the places where the addresses were delivered, and of the audience that heard them. The lecturer's aim was 'to form or to recover such ideas of the Church life' of the first centuries as might 'afterwards admit of further illustrations,' and might 'not require to be cast aside as determined by an erroneous standpoint.' He begins by asking

'What was the primitive Church like as a community? In other words, we may try to see generally what was its constitution, to understand the forces which held it together, its official administration, the rights and duties of its ordinary members. We may next consider its observances, its beliefs, and the type of character which it originated and maintained. We may then look outwards, and endeavour to realize its position in regard to the huge encircling masses of non-Christian social life, and to the ruling powers of the Roman Empire, central or provincial. And lastly, we may ask what methods it took to commend its case to such outsiders as were ready, or might be induced, to judge it fairly—or even to advance from equity to sympathy, and so from sympathy to acceptance' (pp. 1-2).

In pursuing the path here sketched, Dr. Bright soon reaches the central matter of the problem of Sacerdotalism. After observing that it is now too late by many centuries to attempt to naturalize the Hellenistic use of 'Ecclesia' (p. 6 note), and rejecting the unscriptural theory that the Church is merely a voluntary aggregation of individuals (p. 7); he declares that the New Testament represents it as constituted by a divine act, as flowing out from the Lord, as a body into which converts are called, which they do not make, but find made for them (p. 9). This being the case, Dr. Bright shows that it would be consistent to believe also that the Head of the Church instituted a ministry in it, and no more left the ministry than the Church to form itself. He is brought therefore at once to 'the old inquiry,' Did Christ institute such a ministry? Dr. Bright says Yes, and finds himself in conflict with the posthumously published volume of Dr. Hort, who on the subject of the Church and her ministry may be claimed in some (though, happily, not in all respects) as the Dr. Hatch of Cambridge. Many passages in Dr. Hort's book are submitted to a searching examination, and admirably answered.¹ Dr. Bright shows that Dr. Hort has taken very

¹ What are politely called 'little inconsistencies' are pointed out (pp. 13, 15). Dr. Hort is 'proved with hard questions' (pp. 16, 18), and

insuff
men
comm
body
of th
Dr. l
may
suppo
petua
their
Twel
close
there
atten
called
Apos
of 'ev
Churc
of the
Hipp
T

very f
laity,
an im
was r
sense
'had
cleric
58).
impor
baptiz
oppos
thesis

readers
warned
pretati
Lightf
What i
the ide
he has
Pastor
nobody

¹ D
Compa
Minist

² D
accept
VOL

insufficient account of important passages in the New Testament, and in particular insists that the view that the great commission on Easter-night was delivered to the whole body of believers is clean contrary to the subsequent action of the Twelve as Apostles and Church rulers (pp. 14-21). Dr. Bright's own summary is: 'On the whole, then, we may say that the New Testament, naturally interpreted, supports the belief that Christ did will to found a perpetual ministry, and that He did commit its functions in their fulness to "the glorious company" of the selected Twelve' (p. 26). This is the beginning of a period which is closed by the Ignatian evidence, and it is a period in which there are many important points that need Dr. Bright's attention: the existence of local presbyters who were also called episkopoi; the fact that St. Timothy was at first an Apostolic deputy, and then a sole chief pastor; the meaning of 'evangelists and prophets,' and the 'angels of the seven Churches'; a famous passage of St. Clement;¹ the significance of the language of St. Ignatius² himself, and of the so-called Hippolytean canons (pp. 26-46).

The second 'address' (p. 51) is chiefly occupied with a very full and valuable account of the position of the primitive laity, and there are therefore many passages in it which have an important bearing on sacerdotalism. The Apostolic rule was not despotic. Harmony, sympathy, confidence, and a sense of common interest prevailed, and the early believers 'had but little occasion to suspect their pastors of that terrible clerical fault, the love of spiritual power simply as power' (p. 58). Dr. Bright has here an excellent note on the great importance of observing 'that neither the priesthood of all baptized Christians nor the priesthood of Christ can be set in opposition to a ministerial priesthood without a false antithesis' (pp. 58-9). An examination of St. Clement's refer-

readers of his explanation of a text are reminded of the context, and are warned that he seemed 'hardly to realize the consequence of' his interpretation (p. 17). Again Dr. Hort is answered by a quotation from Bishop Lightfoot (p. 21), and in another place from Bishop Ellicott (p. 29). What is 'perhaps the most curious instance of Dr. Hort's bias against the idea of ministerial intervention' is noted (p. 30), as is the fact that he has 'inadequately recognized' a distinction of prepositions in the Pastoral Epistles (p. 31), and in another passage has contradicted what nobody affirms, and affirmed what nobody has contradicted (p. 52).

¹ Dr. Bright's interpretation of *ἐν κοινῷ* will be found on p. 38. Compare Liddon's Appendix to *A Father in Christ*, ed. 2; Gore's *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 317-8 (ed. 1).

² Dr. Jessopp's 'new view of the Ignatian position' finds no more acceptance with Dr. Bright than with Archbishop Temple (pp. 255-6).

ences to the laity leads Dr. Bright to criticize an essay by Mr. Rackham (p. 60, cp. p. 92), and to contrast some earlier and later language of Bishop Lightfoot (p. 64). We are warned to beware of Tertullian's testimony on Catholic usage when he seems to raise a layman for the time being to the level of a priest in an emergency (p. 70). The evidence on the share of the laity in preaching (p. 70), discipline (p. 73), the appointment of clerics (p. 75), and synodical action (p. 79), is duly set forth, and has its varied bearing on our present subject. The consideration of the Cyprianic evidence leads Dr. Bright to mention a few points on which 'it is difficult to follow even Archbishop Benson' (p. 88). But we must leave our readers to find out for themselves what they are. Dr. Bright's conclusion is that the position of the primitive layman was unlike that of modern Romanism, and also unlike that of the Anglican Church under modern conditions of establishment. He points out the practical difficulty of defining a layman nowadays, and expresses the hope 'that our ecclesiastical rulers will be enabled to deal both wisely and loyally with complications which our time has not created but inherited, and which will need full measure of the spirit of right judgment' (p. 99). The remaining addresses in Dr. Bright's book are as full of interesting materials as those which we have just passed under review, but two of them—the fourth, on the environment of the primitive Christian and on the persecutions (p. 153), and the fifth, on the Apologies (p. 200)—must not claim our attention now. The third, however, in addition to some passages on the primitive view of the Lord's Day and the moral life of primitive Christians, enters fully into the views which prevailed in the early Church upon the application of Sacramental principles (p. 100). There is admittedly a very close relation between the doctrine of the Sacraments and the view taken of the origin of the Christian ministry (p. 48), and we cannot conclude with a more fruitful suggestion than to ask our readers to see what Dr. Bright has to report about Ante-Nicene Sacramentalism, and then to ask themselves which of the only two possible views in the last resort (p. 49) on the Christian Ministry is in harmony with the evidence which these early centuries afford. We cannot believe that our Lord ordained Baptism as the means of admission into His covenant of grace, and the Eucharist as the means whereby the members of His body were to plead the merits of His sacrifice before God, and then to feed upon it, without also appointing, in accordance with His expressly declared intention, stewards of those mysteries.

All the
Church
(p. 10)
not o
chann
a min
the p

1. SA
- I
- c
2. TH
- M
- V
3. Li
- S
4. TH
- b

THE
Cante
rical v
biograp
cells
hardly
Gerald

1 T
'Stoics
'Galila
of 'laid
(p. 235)
Eagar
Dr. M
publish
tion of
(Longr
See, ho
2 V
author
for wh
to say
people
old nu

All that Dr. Bright has to tell us of Baptism in the primitive Church (p. 101), Confirmation (p. 104), the Holy Eucharist (p. 105), the exercise of penitential discipline (p. 137), involves not only the Godhead of Him who is both the agent and the channel of grace in every Sacramental ordinance, but also of a ministerial order of divine appointment inseparable from the personal action of the Lord Christ.¹

ART. IX.—ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

1. *St. Thomas of Canterbury: his Death and Miracles.* By EDWIN A. ABBOTT, M.A., D.D. Two Volumes. (London, 1898.)
2. *Thomas, known as Thomas à Becket.* By Miss KATE NORGATE, in *Dictionary of National Biography*. Volume LVI. (London, 1898.)
3. *Life of St. Thomas Becket.* By JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Second and enlarged Edition. (London, 1885.)
4. *The Relics of St. Thomas.* By J. MORRIS, S.J. (Canterbury, 1888.)

THE career, the character, the fame, of St. Thomas of Canterbury² have formed an inexhaustible subject for historical writers from his own day to our own. Besides the special biographies or martyrologies which issued from monastic cells within a century of the archbishop's murder, there is hardly a chronicler of the age who is silent as to his fame. Gerald de Barri, Gervase of Canterbury, William of New-

¹ To the small list of errata must be added 'Arnobius' on p. 143, 'Stoics' on p. 220, and a slight defect of quotation marks after the word 'Galilean' on p. 163. Interesting details, such as on the earliest use of 'laic' as a title of religious dignity (p. 63), on Butler and Origen (p. 235), abound in all directions. We may add here references to Dr. Eagar's *The Christian Ministry in the New Testament* (S. P. C. K.); Dr. Mortimer's Part II. of *Catholic Faith and Practice* (Longmans), just published, pp. 78-133; and Dr. Sanday's Four Sermons on *The Conception of Priesthood* in the early Church and in the Church of England (Longmans). The present writer has not yet seen Dr. Sanday's discourses. See, however, the *Guardian* for December 15, 1898, p. 1932.

² We do not understand why Miss Norgate, herself perhaps our first authority on the age of the Angevins, should revert to the form 'à Becket,' for which we believe that there is no early authority. Mr. Freeman used to say that he believed that there was a sort of tendency among illiterate people to add 'à' after every saint called Thomas, and add that his old nurse used to talk of 'St. Thomas à Didymus'!

bury, Ralph of Dissay, Dean of St. Paul's, and many another witnessed to the interest called out by the life of which French and English biographers had endeavoured to collect every detail. Modern writers, with their minute investigations, give us occasion to reconsider the verdict of history. There can be no question that of all the English Churchmen of the middle ages Thomas Becket, in life and after death, was by far the most popular. Indeed, it may be doubted if there ever has been an Englishman—soldier, sailor, statesman, or priest—who has filled so large a space in the affections of his countrymen for so many centuries. If this sounds exaggerated when we think of some of our heroes, an acquaintance with the books written and the churches built between 1170 and 1538 will supply a sufficient proof. Simon de Montfort was soon forgotten; Elizabeth was never really popular, nor was Oliver Cromwell. Pitt's great fame did not last long except in one class of the community. It is too soon to speak of Gladstone or of the heroic memory of Gordon. Nelson stands nearest in all these centuries to Becket as a hero of the English people.

Within three years of his death the clamorous affection of Englishmen had made the Pope declare him a canonized saint. For the next hundred years the chronicles of nearly every country in Europe told of his fame and the honour paid to his shrine: even distant Iceland had its own story of his life and death, which entered into the hearts of the people, and did something to mould the relations between Church and State in that northern land. In England a new military order took him for its patron saint, and the great city of London claimed to be peculiarly under his protection. There are not less than eighty-four churches certainly dedicated to him in our land; most probably the number is considerably above that, and it exceeds, we believe, any other dedication except that to the Mother of our Lord.¹ Every relic of him became precious beyond the richest jewels. At Sens they preserve his chasuble and stole; there are other vestments of his, we believe, at Stonyhurst. His death became one of the commonest subjects for pictures or frescoes on the walls of churches, of which several, such as the extremely interesting

¹ There are sixty-three churches in England known to be dedicated to St. Thomas Becket, two in Wales, and nine monasteries &c. Besides these, there are forty-one churches in England dedicated to St. Thomas, of which twenty-one are dedicated to St. Thomas the Martyr. Almost certainly these latter are named after Becket, and very probably several of the former. Besides this, almost every church had a 'St. Thomas altar.' At St. Lawrence, Reading, this altar was made as late as 1502.

fit
vive
plac
beca
The
all o
or re
the p
C
scatt
with
of H
beyo
of si
much
in th
in 15
space
they
a vau
altar
for an
extr
his la
altar
lent p
more
rest o
which
skull
of the
a plat
hang
with t
pearl
'C
'C
me.
'C
'C
pomp
1 S
2 J
3 P
honou
the or

fifteenth-century fresco at Pickering in Yorkshire,¹ still survive. But the chiefest memorials remained, of course, in the place where he laid down his life. His tomb at Canterbury became the most famous place of pilgrimage in England. The Cathedral indeed is practically a memorial to him, nearly all of it, through one chance or another, having been built or rebuilt after his death, and largely through the riches which the pilgrims brought to his shrine.

Of the magnificence of the shrine just before the spoilers scattered its treasures we have the accounts of two eye-witnesses. One, a Venetian, who visited England in the time of Henry VII., speaks of its incomparable richness as far beyond anything he had ever seen.² The other, the keenest of sightseers, the scholar, theologian, humanist, who was so much at home among the English folk, Erasmus, has left us in the form of a dialogue a vivid description of what he saw in 1524:

'Ogygius. Iron screens prevent ingress, but allow a view of the space between the extreme end of the church and the place which they call the choir. Thither you ascend by many steps, under which a vault opens passage to the north side. There is shown a wooden altar dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, but mean and not remarkable for anything save as a monument of antiquity, putting to shame the extravagance of these times. Here the holy man is said to have said his last farewell to the Virgin when his death was at hand: On the altar is the point of the sword by which the head of the most excellent prelate was cleft, and his brain dashed out that death might be more instant. For love of the martyr we religiously kissed the sacred rest of this sword. Departing hence we descended to the crypt, which has its own mystagogues. There is shown first the perforated skull of the martyr; the relics are enclosed in silver, the upper part of the head being left bare to be kissed. At the same time is shown a plate of lead with the inscription "Thomas Acrensis."³ There hang there in the dark the hair shirt, the girdles and bands wherewith that prelate subdued his flesh, striking horror by their very appearance, and reproaching us for our softness and indulgence.

'Menedemus. Perchance also the monks?

'Ogy. That I can neither affirm nor deny, nor does it concern me.

'Men. You say right.

'Ogy. After this we were taken into the sacarium. What a pomp of silk vestments was there, and of golden candlesticks! There

¹ See Baigent, *Journal of Archaeological Society*, vol. x. (1855).

² *Venetian Relation of England* (Camden Society).

³ In 1190, on the capture of Acre, a military order was founded in honour of St. Thomas, and he was often called *Acrensis* as Patron of the order.

we saw the pastoral staff of St. Thomas. It appeared to be a cane covered with silver plate. It was of very little weight and no workmanship, and stood no higher than the waist.

'Men. Was there no cross?

'Ogy. I saw none. A pallium was shown, wholly of silk, but of coarse texture, and adorned with no gold or gems. There was also a sudary, dirty from wear, and having manifest marks of blood. . . . From hence we were taken back to the upper floor, for behind the high altar there is another ascent as though into a new church. There in a little chapel is shown the whole figure of the good man, gilt, and adorned with many jewels.

'Men. Did you see the bones?

'Ogy. That is not permitted, nor is it indeed possible without a ladder. But a wooden shrine covers the golden shrine, and when that is drawn up with ropes it lays bare inestimable treasures. The meanest part was gold; every part glistened, shone, and sparkled with rare and very large jewels, some of them exceeding the size of a goose's egg. Then some monks stood around, with much veneration; when the covering was raised we all worshipped. The prior with a rod pointed out each jewel, telling its name in French, its value and the name of the donor. For the chief of them kings had sent as offerings.'

All this has long passed away. But perhaps the greatest memorial of all is one which will last as long as men read books. It is hardly too much to say that the memory of St. Thomas was one of the foundations of English literature, for it gave us Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer was a man who had seen much and read much, and he had a great knowledge of humanity and a great sympathy; nowhere, when he sat down to garner his impressions, could he find a better setting for his studies of human nature and human life than in an English April among the crowds that journeyed to the shrine of St. Thomas:

'And specially from every schirës ende
Of Engelond, to Caunterbury they wende,
The holy blisful martir for to seeke
That them hath holpen whan that they were sick.'

Indeed it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that for four centuries English life in its picturesque and its religious aspects centred round the memory of the great Englishman who laid down his life in the cathedral of Canterbury on December 29, 1170.

Why was this? A brief sketch of his life must be the first part of our answer.

Thomas Becket was born in 1118. His father, Gilbert

¹ Erasmus, *Colloquia*, pp. 331 sqq. (ed. Elzevir).

Becke
Rou
damse
as a
hood
notice
years
the gu
his tru
of Me
then,
school
bisho
Theob
bisho
high p
Theob
Henry
cellor.

Ho
'T
accoun
the kin
the kin
all vac
into th
enter e
bears t
chance
procure
so he
bought

An
office,
king.
what t
their
one he

'W
would
they sa
riding
the kin

1 W
Rolls S

Becket, was sheriff of London. He had come over from Rouen with other Normans after the Conquest, married a damsel of 'burgher birth' from Caen, and risen to prosperity as a merchant. Thomas was a bright child, of whose boyhood many stories were told—a child whom many people noticed, and whom his good mother trained from his earliest years 'to fear the Lord and to invoke the Blessed Virgin as the guide of his paths and the patroness of his life and to lay his trust, after Christ, upon her.' He was taught at the priory of Merton in Surrey; then he worked in an office in London; then, through friends of his father's, he won admission to the school—very like the theological colleges that some of our bishops have attached to their houses to day—of Archbishop Theobald at Canterbury. There he delighted the good archbishop, and when he was only in deacon's orders he rose to high preferment. He studied, too, at Bologna and Auxerre. Theobald had much to do with the peaceable accession of Henry II. in 1154, and the new king made Becket his chancellor.

How great a position this was a contemporary tells us:

'The chancellor of England has so high a dignity that he is accounted second from the king in the realm; he has the charge of the king's seal and seals his own orders with the obverse thereof; the king's chapel is in his charge and care; he takes into his keeping all vacant archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbeys, and baronies that fall into the king's hands; he attends all the king's councils, and may enter even if not summoned; everything is signed by his clerk, who bears the king's seal; and everything ordered by the advice of the chancellor; so that if by God's grace his well-spent life should procure it for him, he shall not die save as archbishop or bishop, if so he please. And thus it is that the chancellorship is not to be bought.'¹

And Thomas's greatness was due not only to his high office, but to the closeness of his personal relations with the king. Two bright, active, keen-sighted men, impatient to do what they thought should be done, they both came to look on their work with the same eyes, and to do it together with one heart. And as they worked they played.

'When work was over,' says the same observer, 'the king and he would play together like boys of the same age; in hall, in church, they sat together, or together they rode out. One day they were riding together in the streets of London; the winter was severe: the king saw an old man coming, poor, in thin and ragged garb, and

¹ W. Fitzstephen (*Materials for the History of Archbishop Becket*, Rolls Series, iii. 41).

he said to the chancellor, "Do you see him?" "I see," said the chancellor. The king: "How poor he is, how feeble, how scantily clad. Would it not be great charity to give him a thick warm cloak?" The chancellor: "Great indeed; and, my king, you ought to have a mind and an eye to it." Meanwhile the poor man came up; the king stopped, and the chancellor with him. The king pleasantly accosted him and asked if he would have a good cloak. The poor man, who knew them not, thought that this was a jest, not earnest. The king to the chancellor: "You shall do this great charity," and laying hands on his hood he tried to pull off the cape—a new and very good one of scarlet and grey—which the chancellor wore, and which he strove to retain. Then was there great commotion and noise, and the knights and nobles in their train hurried up wondering what might be the cause of so sudden a strife; no one could tell: both were engaged with their hands, and more than once seemed likely to fall off their horses. At last the chancellor, long reluctant, allowed the king to win, to pull off his cape and give it to the poor man. Then first the king told the story to his attendants; great was the laughter of all; some offered their capes and cloaks to the chancellor. And the poor old man went off with the chancellor's cape, unexpectedly happy, and rich beyond expectations, and giving thanks to God.

"Sometimes the king would come to the chancellor's house, sometimes for fun, sometimes for the sake of seeing whether the talk of his house and his table were true. Sometimes the king rode on horseback into the hall where the chancellor sat at meat; sometimes, bow in hand, returning from hunting or on his way to the chase; sometimes he would drink and depart when he had seen the chancellor. Sometimes jumping over the table he would sit down and eat with him. Never in Christian times were there two men more of one mind or better friends."¹

The chroniclers dwell on the lavish magnificence of his household, the train of knights and pages who followed him and fed at his table, the grandeur of his equipage when he went on embassy to the king of the Franks. The people, they say, rushed from their houses to see the train, and cried, 'Marvellous is the king of the English whose chancellor goeth thus and so grandly.' But in all this those who knew him noted also the simplicity of his personal life. The Icelandic 'Saga,' embodying an English chronicle, speaks of his manner of life thus:

"The holy fathers have made plain that a chaste monk is like unto a knight who keepeth his wealth and life in a close stronghold. But he who liveth chastely in the world signifieth a knight who fighteth with sword and shield in open field and receiveth a greater reward the more glorious victory he gaineth; for that indeed is a more wondrous art to stand on the embers being unburnt than to

¹ W. Fitzstephen (*Materia*, iii. 22).

shun
lauda
in the
hath
such
that
for if
would

S
be lit
own
Ther
It wa
tury
enou
mom
had t
was
been
of a
form
in E
supr
Chur
Henr
sway

T
issue
clear
T
king
Henr
said

1
2
princi
chapl
cares
mous
view
Becke
there
is clea
life of
3
Ad an
4

shun the fire and be unscathed. Both these signs point to that laudable man the blessed Thomas. He was placed by the lord king in the way of such a good hap and fulness of this world's bliss as hath been before told, and yet he wore over his breast nevertheless such a trusty hauberk of virtue through God's abiding with him that he never departed from a life of purity and holy endeavour; for if in the daytime the fulfilment of many duties hindered he would get up at night-tide to worship his Creator.¹

Such is the life which the chroniclers describe, there can be little doubt, from tales dropped in later years from Becket's own lips.² It went on happily enough for nearly eight years. Then Theobald died, and Henry made his friend archbishop. It was natural, inevitable, and yet, as with Hildebrand a century earlier, the result was foreseen.³ Becket, it was clear enough, was a man of conscience fixed and firm. From the moment of his ordination to the priesthood, June 2, 1162, he had to choose—so he felt—between God and the king. It was not that his life as chancellor seemed to him to have been sinful. It was rather that his work then was the work of a statesman. He had aided Henry in all those great reforms that made the first years of his reign a turning-point in English history. But from his consecration he was supremely responsible for the fate and future of the English Church, and with the Church it was impossible to doubt that Henry II., like other kings before him since feudalism had sway, would come into open conflict.

The contest came soon, and it was long and bitter. Its issues, however, can in our day be quickly discerned and clearly summed up.

The first occasion of contention between the two friends, king and archbishop, was a question of certain dues which Henry wished to have paid in a certain way which Thomas said would be unjust.⁴ The friends quarrelled. Then came

¹ *Saga* (ed. Magnusson, Rolls Series), i. 50.

² Our information for the earlier years of Becket's life is derived principally from William Fitzstephen, 'the fellow-citizen of my lord, his chaplain, and of his household, called by his mouth to be a sharer of his cares,' from John of Salisbury (who quotes his own words), and the anonymous writer whom Mr. Freeman, in his articles in the *Contemporary Review*, 1878, identified with Roger, a monk of Pontigny, in which house Becket dwelt in exile. Dr. Abbott and Miss Norgate both consider that there is not sufficient evidence for this identification; but in any case it is clear that the writer had practically first-hand evidence for the personal life of his hero.

³ Cf. Herbert of Bosham (*Materials*, iii. 180) with Bonitho, *Liber Ad amicam*, in Jaffé, *Monumenta Gregoriana*, p. 657.

⁴ See Grim (*Materials*, ii. 374). A brief note on the subject in *St.*

what seemed to be a question of religious principle. Henry declared that there were a number of clerical offenders who escaped with only light punishment—strictly speaking, who, being clergymen and claimed by the Church courts, could not lose life or limb as laymen did, though they could be imprisoned for life. The Constitutions of Clarendon, 1164, drawn up by the king's clerks, asserted this view. Becket, and the clergy who were of his mind—and the Pope was with them—refused to assent to this claim. The question was simply this: Should the Church or the State have the final judgment of clergy who had broken the law? Should they be summoned before the lay courts, there charged with the crime, then judged, if the bishop claimed them, in the Church court, and then sent back to the lay court to receive a civil punishment besides the ecclesiastical one which the Church court might have thought fit to inflict? This was what Henry claimed.¹

Becket, on the other hand, declared that this would be giving two punishments for the same offence, contrary to the elementary principles of justice. Not less strongly did he assert that the Church had the privilege of exclusively judging all clerical offenders.

That was the question between them: the king on one side with many bishops and barons at his back; Becket on the other with the great majority of the clergy and people of his mind. What is the meaning of it to us now? Bossuet, two centuries ago, compressed its significance thus: 'The discipline of the Church as well as her faith must have its martyrs.' The claim was really that each separate estate of the realm should have its own laws, its own rights, its own judges, its own punishments. It was a claim that could not possibly be upheld in face of a united nation, a united state. But then, when law and custom and the routine of public business were but very slight checks on a strong, despotic, arbitrary king, the hope for English liberty was thought by most Englishmen to lie in the assertion of the rights of each class as against the Crown. But there was more that won Becket support. There was a revolt of public feeling against

Thomas of Canterbury, W. H. Hutton, p. 37; but cf. J. H. Round, *Feudal England*, pp. 497-502.

¹ This statement of Henry's claim is based on the article of Professor Maitland, *English Historical Review*, April 1892, which on the whole seems more fully to meet the difficulties of the question which the language of the chroniclers raises than the older explanations. Dr. Maitland reprints the article in his recently published (1898) *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, pp. 132-147.

the h
broug
for H
rights
vants

Be
foreign
damag
Pope
one p
Gradu
exiled
friend
petual
way, c

At
his yo
that p
The P
the ki
munio
to be a

Re
his dic
of two
the old

'It
archbis
least to
silks an
people.
church
city eve
sermon
seek on

He
'Or
landed,
approac
victim s
and ova
received
passed,
some th

the barbarous punishments that the Norman kings had brought in. There was a reverence, approaching superstition, for Holy Orders, for the Sanctuary of the Church, for the rights that the Redeemer might have claimed for His servants on earth.

Becket was in danger of his life. He had to fly to foreign lands, and he was a wanderer for six years. Henry damaged his position by cruelty, intrigue and malice. The Pope was in great political danger, and pitiably turned from one party to the other, only to meet the sarcasms of both. Gradually Becket's seclusion became like the court of an exiled king. His vehemence seemed only to win him more friends. Henry's firmness seemed only to lead him to perpetual blunders. The conscience of Europe, in some strange way, came clearly to the archbishop's side.

At last Henry infringed on the ancient custom by having his young son crowned by the Archbishop of York; and on that point Becket's constitutional position was unassailable. The Pope at the same time pronounced decidedly against the king. It was clear that he would be put out of communion. He yielded. The old friends met, and they seemed to be at peace again.

Relying on Henry's safe-conduct, Becket went back to his diocese. The account of his home-coming, in the words of two of his friends, is among the most touching passages in the old histories. He landed on December 1, 1170.

'It became known at Canterbury,' says Fitzstephen,¹ 'that the archbishop had landed. Then all in the town rejoiced from the least to the greatest. They decked the Cathedral. They put on silks and costly array. They prepared a great banquet for many people. The archbishop was received in solemn procession. The church resounded with hymns and music, the hall with rejoicing, the city everywhere with fulness of joy. He preached a most instructive sermon, taking for text, "Here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come."²

Herbert of Bosham tells the tale more fully :

'On the morrow the archbishop left the harbour where he had landed, which was distant about six miles from Canterbury. As he approached the city he was awaited by the poor of the land as a victim sent from heaven, yea even as the angel of God, with prayer and ovation. But why do I say with ovation? Rather Christ's poor received him as the Lord's anointed. So, wherever the archbishop passed, crowds of poor, small and great, old and young, ran together, some throwing themselves in his way, others taking their garments

¹ *Materials*, iii. 119.

² Heb. xiii. 14.

and strawing them in the way, crying and exclaiming "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Likewise the priests with their parishioners, met him in procession with their crosses, saluting their father, and begging his blessing, reiterated that oft-repeated cry, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." But wherefore thus? You would have said, had you seen, that the Lord a second time approached His Passion, and that among the children and the poor and the rejoicing people again He who died once at Jerusalem for the salvation of the whole world was now again ready to die at Canterbury for the English Church. And though the way was short yet among the thronging and pressing crowds scarce in that day could he reach Canterbury, where he was received with the sound of trumpets, with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs by the poor of Christ, His children, and by his holy monastery with the reverence and veneration due to their father. Then might you see at his first coming into the cathedral the face of this man, which many seeing marked and wondered at, for it seemed as though his heart aflame showed also in his face. . . . And the disciple who wrote these things when he observed these things, and observed with wonder, recalled to mind what is told of Moses. . . . Then the archbishop standing on his episcopal throne received to the kiss of peace each brother, one by one, with many sighs and tears from all. And as he stood there stood by him the disciple who wrote these things, and said "My lord, it matters not now when you depart hence, since to-day in you Christ's Bride has conquered; yea, Christ conquers, Christ reigns, Christ rules." And he looked upon him that said these things, yet said he nothing.

And when all things in the cathedral were solemnly ended, the archbishop went to his palace, thus having finished that joyful and solemn day.¹

This joy, so genuine an expression of the feelings of the English folk, was not long to last. The archbishop, with strict legal justification,² refused, unless they 'gave satisfaction,' to absolve the bishops whom he had, with perhaps as much personal eagerness as zeal for Church discipline, excommunicated. They laid their complaints before the king. Roger of Pont l'Evêque, archbishop of York, the lifelong foe of Becket, told Henry that he would never have peace as long as the primate was alive,³ and according to one authority⁴ even urged on the knights who set out, at Henry's hasty words of rage, to 'avenge him on the low clerk.' Supplied with money by Roger of York, and with words of his put into their mouths,

¹ *Materials*, iii. 478.

² See Constitutions of Clarendon, clause v., and compare the practice of Roman law as to 'vadium ad remanens,' *Institutes*, ed. Moyle, i. 670, and Poste's *Gaius*, lib. iv. sect. 185.

³ W. Fitzstephen (*Materials*, iii. 127).

⁴ Garnier de Pont S. Maxence, ed. Hippeau, pp. 174 sqq.

they
coura
him
he sa
and
was

The
door
Hou
V
the e
tried

'I
Beck
cried
intrep
shall
been
voice
Why
feared
Who
your
turne
the b
of St
havin
murd
no lo
they
comm
suspe
I will
receiv
my L
But i
wheth
the h
give h
inclin
them
to St
the w
by th
woun
off th
dedic

they came to Canterbury. Becket was a man of undaunted courage, and he would not yield an inch when they ordered him to absolve the bishops and leave his diocese. The first, he said, he could not, the second he would not, do. He knew, and so did all the timid monks at his side, that his death was certain.

The last scene must happen in his own cathedral church. The monks when he came to vespers would have bolted the doors, but he said, 'It is not meet to make a fortress of the House of God. We came to suffer, not resist.'

We have the words of three at least who were present at the end. Thus wrote Edward Grim, the monk, who himself tried to save the martyr :

'Inspired by fury the knights called out, "Where is Thomas Becket, traitor to the king and realm?" As he answered not, they cried out the more furiously, "Where is the archbishop?" At this, intrepid and fearless, as it is written, "The just, like a bold lion, shall be without fear," he descended from the stair where he had been dragged by the monks in fear of the knights, and in a clear voice answered, "I am here, no traitor to the king, but a priest. Why do ye seek me?" And whereas he had already said that he feared them not, he added, "So I am ready to suffer in His name Who redeemed me by His Blood : be it far from me to flee from your swords, or to depart from justice." Having thus said, he turned to the right, under a pillar, having on one side the altar of the blessed Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, on the other that of St. Benedict the Confessor : by whose example and prayers, having crucified the world with its lusts, he bore all that the murderers could do with such constancy of soul as if he had been no longer in the flesh. The murderers followed him ; "Absolve," they cried, "and restore to communion those whom you have excommunicated, and restore their powers to those whom you have suspended." He answered : "There has been no satisfaction, and I will not absolve them." "Then you shall die," they cried, "and receive what you deserve." "I am ready," he replied, "to die for my Lord, that in my blood the Church may obtain liberty and peace. But in the name of Almighty God, I forbid you to hurt my people whether clerk or lay." . . . Then the unconquered martyr, seeing the hour at hand which should put an end to this miserable life and give him straightway the crown of immortality promised by the Lord, inclined his neck as one who prays, and joining his hands he lifted them up, and commended his cause and that of the Church to God, to St. Mary, and to the blessed martyr Denys. Scarce had he said the words than the wicked knight fearing lest he should be rescued by the people and escape alive, leapt upon him suddenly and wounded this lamb who was sacrificed to God on the head, cutting off the top of the crown which the sacred unction of the chrism had dedicated to God ; and by the same blow he wounded the arm of

him who tells this. For he, when the others, both monks and clerks, fled, stuck close to the sainted archbishop and held him in his arms till the one he interposed was almost severed. . . . Then he received a second blow on the head, but still stood firm. At the third blow he fell on his knees and elbows, offering himself a living victim, and saying in a low voice, "For the Name of Jesus and the protection of the Church I am ready to embrace death." Then the third knight inflicted a terrible wound as he lay, by which the sword was broken against the pavement, and the crown, which was large, was separated from the head; so that the blood white with the brain and the brain red with blood, dyed the surface of the virgin mother Church with the life and death of the confessor and martyr in the colours of the lily and the rose. The fourth knight prevented any from interfering so that the others might freely perpetrate the murder. As to the fifth, no knight, but that clerk who had entered with the knights, that a fifth blow might not be wanting to the martyr who was in other things like to Christ, put his foot on the neck of the holy priest and precious martyr, and, horrible to say, scattered his brains and blood over the pavement, calling out to the others, "Let us away, knights; he will rise no more."¹

It is impossible to doubt the feeling which speaks in those words. It was the feeling which made all Europe horror-stricken at the deed, which raised the shrine and gathered the miracles that made St. Thomas the most famous of English saints.

Thus far we have felt impelled to tell again, briefly, but in the light which recent investigations have shed on it, the tale of Becket's life and death. We have told it because, to our minds, it sufficiently explains the fame of one who became a national hero. We have told it because, with an admitted *arrière pensée* which we do not share, Dr. Abbott has subjected its later stages to a searching scrutiny in the light of theories which he entertains as to the composition and value of the Synoptic Gospels. The Becket literature is made, in the recent work to which we refer, a convenient vantage-ground from which to attack the credibility of the sacred records. To Dr. Abbott, then, we must now turn, with the story we have retold still fresh in our minds.

Dr. Abbott tells us that he has been led to investigate closely the causes of Becket's fame, and particularly the early narratives of his death and his miracles, because these documents, when closely studied, presented 'parallelisms to problems of New Testament criticism so exact and so helpful that, instead of forming a few paragraphs in' his 'proposed work [a critical commentary on the four Gospels] the extracts

¹ *Materials*, ii. 431 sqq.

and
sect
stan
Dr.

criti
spac
worl

Savi
'the
para
criti
St. T
narr
Chri
para
and

of its
in vis
word
some
instan
impar
the S
lifes
the c
what
first
(ii. 30

But t
belie
of th

'S
explic
men,
from
instan
out of
ping
food;
these
fusion
of me

To c

and notes grew first into a chapter and then into a separate section,' and from 'this, he further explains, into the two substantial volumes now published. There are two points in Dr. Abbott's treatment of his subject which concern us chiefly.

The first is the relation of the Becket history to the criticism of the Gospels. This, though it occupies but little space in Dr. Abbott's book, is clearly the core of the whole work.

Dr. Abbott entitles his last chapter 'The Martyr and the Saviour,' and he divides the chapter into four sections, on 'the parallel between them,' 'the parallel in facts,' 'the parallel in documents,' and 'its bearing on New Testament criticism.' The first section asserts that though the scope of St. Thomas compared with that of St. Francis was 'indeed narrow,' the 'peculiarity of St. Thomas's helpfulness for Christians at the present time is to be discerned in the old parallel, drawn by his contemporaries, between the Martyr and the Saviour.' The second section puts this parallel thus:

'Two men, put to death by the powers of this world as disturbers of its peace; two men, who, after death, immediately began to appear in visions, with the marks of martyrdom upon them, and to utter words of help or warning, and to work mighty works of healing, sometimes imparting to those who believed in them the power of instantaneously shaking off apparently incurable disease, sometimes imparting the power of curing disease in others, through appeal to the Saviour or the Martyr, sometimes reanimating the apparently lifeless in such circumstances as to suggest a veritable raising from the dead—here in itself is a parallel worth considering. Again, what follows? By degrees, in both cases, the miracles, after the first great outburst, diminish, fade away, come finally to nothing' (ii. 307).

But this is not the whole of the similarity which Dr. Abbott believes that he has established by his minute investigation of the narratives of Becket's miracles. He adds:

'Side by side with these acts of healing—marvellous indeed, but explicable from known natural causes—we find attributed to both men, or to the Providence that worked for them, acts inexplicable from any such causes, such as the change of water to wine, the instantaneous withering of a tree, the leaping or extraction of a fish out of the water in order to provide for some special need, the stopping of a mill-wheel by itself, the multiplication of money, or of food; and, in the case of both men, we find it possible to explain these stories, when they occur in the earliest narratives, from a confusion of the spiritual with the material, and from a misunderstanding of metaphor as literal.'

To clinch his argument he adds that while some of the Gospel

narratives may have been written as early as thirty years after our Lord's death, many of the accounts of Becket's life and death were written within five years of his martyrdom, and the accounts of the miracles at the very time of their occurrence.

We confess that we do not think it necessary to deal with statements such as these at any length. We need only point out that there is all the difference in the world between attributing the miracles to a particular Person and attributing them to 'the Providence that worked for' a man. The first and necessary distinction that must be drawn is between the clear and explicit claim of the Gospels that the 'signs,' 'wonders,' 'works,' of Christ were the natural actions of His Divine Personality, with the fact that the evangelical writers indisputably believed Him to be God, and, on the other side, the equally patent fact that no one claimed divine powers for Thomas Becket. The witnesses and the writers of the twelfth century saw a clear distinction between Christ and His servant, and never dreamed that anyone would doubt it. The claim made for Becket must be compared, if it be compared with the sacred records at all, with the claim of St. Peter in Acts iv. 10, 'that by the Name of Jesus of Nazareth . . . even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole.'

And more than this. It seems to us that Dr. Abbott forgets what surely vitiates the whole of the conclusions with regard to our Lord's miracles at which he seems to have arrived. The similarity between miracles recorded in the Gospels and those attributed to Becket is obviously due to conscious or unconscious imitation. Our Lord's miracles (as Mr. Gladstone showed in his convincing review of *Robert Elsmere*) came to a world which was familiar with portents and convinced it of their truth. They were distinct, original, creative. Those who saw the occurrences at the shrine, or registered the cures, or recorded the visions, of St. Thomas of Canterbury, had always the Gospels in their minds. Whether we believe in the Becket miracles or not, it is clear enough that they were imitative: in other words, they would not have been but for the Gospel story. This, we think—and there are of course many minor details which from different quarters support our view—renders Dr. Abbott's careful examination of the miracles of Becket practically valueless as an aid to Biblical criticism. Thus it is of no concern to our present purpose to learn that Dr. Abbott thinks that none of the Gospel miracles can be explained by imposture; that he

find
Jain
thin
the
Abb
not

V
exist
of D
in F
occu
Cath
pass
expr
whor
leave
also
as it

F
impo
affect
Gosp
espec
into
that
we no
mirac
the se

T
early
In thi
medie
knowl
points
to be
stephe
observ
Becke
Fitzst
out.
Freem
with R
identif
Merton
plausib
VOL

finds it 'quite easy to accept the story of the raising of Jairus's daughter,' because she was not really dead, and thinks that 'the raising of Lazarus is far more credible than the raising at Nain.' These things, and many more in Dr. Abbott's pages, may make the judicious grieve, but they need not alarm the weakest faith.

We might pause, if our concern now were with the existence of miracles at all—and really the ultimate argument of Dr. Abbott must return to that—to remind ourselves that in France miracles are still believed by intelligent men to occur (we might refer to M. Huysmans' treatment, in *La Cathédrale*, of M. Zola's *Lourdes*), and to note the striking passage in Dr. Pusey's *Spiritual Letters* in which he expresses his belief in the supernatural cures among those whom he knew; but this is not our present purpose. We leave the large and interesting subject of medieval miracles also behind, and return to the criticism of Dr. Abbott's book as it affects the history of Becket.

From miracle he passes to document. Little, if any, importance attaches to this part of the book, for no inference affecting the history of Becket, still less any regarding the Gospels, can be drawn from the fact that there were four especially valuable Lives of the saint, or that these were made into a *Quadriologus*, of which there are two recensions, or that some of the biographies were written in French. This we note in passing; our business is rather with the death and miracles of St. Thomas as Dr. Abbott treats them. This is the second point which concerns us.

The book is an exhaustive and minute criticism of the early accounts of the murder and of the miracles of Becket. In this aspect it has a claim to be read by all students of medieval history. We do not think that it adds much to our knowledge, but it certainly clears and concentrates it. Some points in detail are worth noticing. Dr. Abbott hardly seems to be aware of the explanation of the fact that William Fitzstephen's biography was not used in the *Quadriologus*, or to observe how that very fact differentiates the harmony of Becket Lives from Tatian's *Diatesseron*: a quadriloge without Fitzstephen is a harmony with the best of the sources left out. We have noted that Dr. Abbott will have none of Mr. Freeman's argument for the identification of 'Anonymous I.' with Roger of Pontigny. We may add that he appears to identify him with Robert, a canon of the religious house of Merton, who was Becket's confessor. This is at least a plausible suggestion. On the other hand the account given

of the Icelandic Becket Saga is hardly adequate. Considerable interest attaches to its connexion with the lost biography by Robert of Cricklade, prior of St. Frideswide's, Oxford, which seems to have been the earliest Life of the saint to reach Iceland, and which was there combined with the *History of the Passion and Miracles* by Benedict of Canterbury.¹

Criticisms may here and there be offered on details of the work, but the general result, from the standpoint of the historian, is distinctly praiseworthy. This is the first time that the importance of what may be called the career of Becket after death has been thoroughly investigated. The result is to place before English readers an exceedingly curious collection of medieval miracles. The nature of these varies almost infinitely according to the date at which they were written down and the persons who recorded them. It may suffice to quote Dr. Abbott's opinion of Benedict, the first authority :

'Benedict, who was the first appointed to report the miracles, seems to have been well adapted for the task ; a man of (comparatively) simple and unaffected style, peculiarly accurate (for those times) in matters of chronology, free from exaggeration, and disposed to suspect exaggeration and imposture in others. Hence great weight must be attached to his accounts of the early miracles. The diseases healed by them were for the most part (as might have been anticipated) nervous disorders, such as might be cured by a strong emotional shock. In some cases Benedict frankly tells us that the cure was not at first perfect ; in others that it was followed by relapse. In one case he informs us that the reputed water of St. Thomas was not St. Thomas's at all. It was a fraudulent imitation ; yet it performed the desired cure.'

We do not desire to pass judgment on the credibility of the various miracles. This would involve an examination as detailed as Dr. Abbott's. Still less do we intend to discuss the whole subject of medieval miracles, without which an isolated treatment of the Becket cycle would be of very slight value. With much of the detailed examination of Dr. Abbott there is no need to demur. It establishes, what every student of the literature must have long decided for himself, that while there was, as time went on, much imposture and much confusion, and much record without evidence, and much healing that is easily explained on purely natural grounds, there still remain cases which may be conveniently treated as due to 'faith', in some inexplicable way, but which to the Chris-

¹ See *Dictionary of National Biography*, article 'Robert of Cricklade.'

tian
actin
ence
impo
due

I
or fr
that
mere
reste
of or

once
cured
either
that h
an ac
pilgr
Apos
been
There

reviva
mirac
upris
multi
was b
built
worsh
again
secula
strong
the Sa

again
Engla
in the
a Sain
those
But th
not an
"Eng
wrong
the E
defect
their
champ

M
more.
saint

tion seem to involve an obvious relation to the Divine Power acting in a manner which is beyond ordinary human experience. Within the limits of our present knowledge it is impossible to do more than to admit that there were signs due to 'the power of God.'

Dr. Abbott asks: 'Did the miracles result from the man or from the circumstances?' Was it the nature of his death that brought the miracles? If he had died in his bed, he as mere Archbishop Thomas Becket, it is said, 'would have rested, an unhelpful corpse, with other commonplace corpses of ordinary archbishops in an unvisited grave.'

'This is so far true,' says Dr. Abbott, 'that we must admit at once that Becket, dying an ordinary death, would probably not have cured a single spasm of rheumatism. But it by no means follows, either that other Saints would have made up for his deficiency, or that he is so far to be separated from his death that it is to be called an accident instead of an act. If Becket had died in his bed, pilgrims might still have gone to St. Edmund, St. James, the two Apostles in Rome, or the Tomb in Jerusalem; but it would have been in the old slack and (comparatively) lifeless and formal way. There is no more reason to doubt that Becket caused a religious revival, than that Wesley and Whitfield did. The two chroniclers of miracles agree in asserting that the miracles brought with them an uprising of moral and religious fervour, and indirectly prove it by multitudinous details recorded without controversial purpose. It was brief indeed, but it was powerful, while it lasted. The churches built by the Archbishop's former enemies as well as by his countless worshippers, are outward monuments of a strong inward protest against the violent and oppressive character often assumed by the secular forces of the time—or at all events of concessions from the strong to the strength of such a protest from the weak. It was not the Saxon against the Norman, it was the poor and weak oppressed against the rich and strong oppressor, that everywhere—alike in England and France and through the Latin-speaking world—rose up in the might of St. Thomas the Martyr, and decreed that he must be a Saint, even before the Papal edict had made him one. Most of those healed in the days of the earliest miracles have English names. But their passionate reverence and their wonder-working faith did not arise in their hearts from patriotic motives, because they were "English born." It was because they were wronged or liable to be wronged, that they took up the cause for which the New Martyr of the English had shed his blood. The Church, though sometimes defective and corrupt, was nevertheless felt by the poor to be often their only protection against outrage, and the martyr typified her championing spirit' (ii. 301).

Much of this is undoubtedly true. And we may add more. The popular admiration which had followed the saint in his life, because he withstood to their faces, again and

again, king and Pope and barons and bishops, clung to him after death because of the abiding national sense that he had been an heroic champion in a great national struggle. And here we may note the great merit of Miss Norgate's narrative in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Here and there her research has revealed a new fact, or supplied a new inference, for the history of Becket. But most of all the value of her work lies in the fact that, though hampered by the stern editorial restriction as to style,¹ and confined to the jejune allotment of space which the garrulousness of some of the earlier contributors has rendered necessary for the later volumes, she has with masterly precision and lucidity made the tale speak for itself and show the martyr for the hero that he was. It was not the attraction of a peculiarly Roman type of sanctity, or the character of a devoted son of the Papacy, as Father John Morris, in his otherwise admirable biography, seemed to suggest, that made Becket famous. It was the thoroughly English determination of his life, the steadfast appeal for justice against despotism. It was the struggle of a statesman who saw the danger of all power being absorbed by the centralized state. It was the struggle of the priest who knew that while the statesman's work was noble, there was a higher claim in the Church and the souls of men. Becket never ceased to be a statesman; but in his later years he became inspired, before all things, with the passion of the priest. A spiritual society, a body which asserts for itself the care of man's spiritual nature, must have spiritual rules—laws for its own members. If these conflict with other rules, then the members of the spiritual society must be ready to suffer for the faith they believe and the rules they obey. For the Church, like every other society, though nowadays we seem in danger of forgetting it, has *rights*—rights which those who believe in Jesus Christ and His Commission must be prepared to defend and, if need be, to die for. St. Thomas said again and again that he would do such or such an act 'saving his order.' It is a proviso that must be always necessary. Priests can only act in the ordinary affairs of life with the understanding that they must be loyal before all things to the law to which they are bound. Lay folk similarly must do their work in the world in the light of the revelation that they are citizens also of a Heavenly City, whose rules above all things they must obey.

This is the supreme lesson of the life of the great English

¹ This was recently described by the Master of the Temple at a gathering of the contributors as 'no flowers, by request.'

saint. This it is which is unfolded in page after page of that remarkable series of letters which was copied and handed about all through the middle ages, a collection than which there is none other so full and so intimate in medieval history save, perhaps, that of St. Bernard. This it is which made natural the promptness with which Henry VIII., when he had embarked on a campaign against individual liberty, recognized the bygone saint as a deadly foe. In August 1538, fourteen years after Erasmus had seen the wonders of the shrine, Thomas Cromwell directed its destruction. The bones, which had rested in an iron chest since the translation by Stephen Langton in 1220, were 'then and there brent.'¹ It was a fit expression of the triumph of the Tudor despotism.

It was as a gallant fight for liberty that Englishmen cherished the memory of Becket's career. And beyond all the causes of his fame that we can coldly estimate is the unquestionable heroism and picturesqueness of his life. It is a tale of passion, determination, courage to the death, that stirs the blood as we read it now; and there are few scenes in English history so rich in tragic fascination as that of the twilight hour in Canterbury Cathedral when the tall strong priest gave himself to death for what he believed to be the call of duty and the voice of God.

ART. X.—'A SERIOUS CALL.'

A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life, Adapted to the State and Condition of all Orders of Christians. By WILLIAM LAW, A.M. A new edition with Preface and Notes by J. H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Gumley. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1898.)

WE write this article with a definite purpose in view. It shall be our endeavour to give such an account of Law's *Serious Call*, and of this the best edition of it that has ever been published, as shall lead everyone who has not read it

¹ The fate of the bones has been the subject of a keen controversy which can hardly be said yet to be ended. We believe that an opinion is still held at Canterbury that the bones found in 1888 were those of St. Thomas. But to our mind the evidence of Stowe (*Annals*, Sept. 1538) and of the Consistorial Acts (cf. *Annales Eccles. cont. Baronii*, tom. xiii. 494) is sufficient; cf. *Letters &c. Henry VIII.* vol. xiii. pt. 2, p. 49. And Miss Norgate takes this view.

to set about the task as soon as possible. This may be done most luxuriously for eight and sixpence in Canon Overton's edition, but the piety, wisdom, and wit of William Law's most famous work is, we believe, within the reach of all who can afford and are willing to spend ninepence on good literature.¹ It may be convenient at the outset to say what course we propose to pursue. We shall first of all show in what good company we find ourselves when we profess to have a very hearty admiration for Law's logical powers, a sensation of pleasure by reason of his wit, and a deep respect for his consistent piety. The testimony to this is so weighty, and his own book so convincing on these points, that we shall not shrink from the quotation of all the adverse criticism of which we have cognizance. We shall then put before our readers a precise account of the contents of the *Serious Call*, and quote passages from it as samples of the whole. This will show why the book has been included in the series of reprints to which this edition belongs; and finally we shall examine the special marks of the work done by Canon Overton as the editor and annotator of the volume. He is too good a scholar, and too sincere an admirer of William Law, to find fault with us for putting the author first and the editor second. But we may add that in all the steps of our design we shall owe much to the labour which Canon Overton has bestowed upon the work.

The *Serious Call* was published in 1728, and as it has always been Law's lot to influence many who held neither his later views on Mysticism, nor his life-long position with regard to sacramental principles, we are not surprised to hear Canon Overton's unhesitating declaration that 'there is little doubt that the great Evangelical revival . . . owed its first impetus to this book more than to any other,' and that among the leaders of that revival there was scarcely one who was not more or less affected by it (Pref. pp. ix, xiv). For three years John Wesley, whose religious impressions had been revived at Oxford by the *Serious Call* and two other books, preached after the model of Mr. Law's practical treatises, and though he afterwards came under other influences and discarded Mr. Law as a guide, he never lost his admiration of the *Serious Call*, as 'a treatise which will hardly be excelled, if it be equalled, either for beauty of expression or for depth of thought.' This was only eighteen months before his death, and he made the work a text-book for the highest class in his school at Kingswood. The book produced an alteration in

¹ In the *Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature*.

the
pow
repe
and
Sco
Law
valu
For
upo
men
tion
usu
nam
Lav
boo
But
the
beca
com
piec
quor
styl
divi
read
Ove
prin
that
Joh
dec
min
cou
nec
We
spe
allo
con
allo
trut
and
we
we
say

1
2
an e

the 'views and feelings' of Charles Wesley; 'God worked powerfully' upon the soul of Whitefield by it; Venn read it repeatedly and tried to frame his life according to its model; and its perusal became the turning-point in the life of Thomas Scott (Pref. pp. xiii-xv). Bishop Warburton said, 'Mr. Wm. Law begat Methodism.'¹ But weighty evidence of the value of the book is at hand from some very different quarters. For example, on three occasions Dr. Johnson pronounced upon the book, or upon its author, and we can here supplement Canon Overton's too vague references by exact pagination, and we may add that the much abused Croker adds his usual excellent biographical note to the first mention of Law's name. 'When at Oxford,' says the Doctor, 'I took up Law's *Serious Call to a Holy Life* expecting to find it a dull book, as such books generally are, and perhaps to laugh at it. But I found Law quite an overmatch for me; and this was the first occasion of my thinking in earnest of religion after I became capable of rational enquiry.' Again: 'he much commended Law's *Serious Call*, which, he said, was the finest piece of hortatory theology in any language.' And again, to quote a remark in what is supposed to be the true Johnsonian style: 'William Law, Sir, wrote the best piece of parenetic divinity.' He adds, what shows that he could hardly have read the three letters to Hoadly, justly called by Canon Overton 'a most brilliant and powerful defence of Church principles against the latitudinarianism and erastianism of' that prelate (Pref. p. x), that 'Law was no reasoner.'² Beside Johnson's opinion may be placed the witness of Gibbon. He declared that if 'Mr. Law finds a spark of piety in his reader's mind, he will soon kindle it into a flame,' 'intimating, of course,' says Canon Overton, 'at the same time, that the necessary spark was not existent in himself' (Pref. p. xiv). We do not forget that Gibbon had domestic reasons for speaking kindly of Law, but his keen intellect would not have allowed his emotions to praise an author unless he had been convinced that his praise was just. 'A philosopher must allow,' he said, 'that Law exposes with equal sincerity and truth the strange contradiction which exists between the faith and practice of the Christian world' (p. xii). From Gibbon we may pass to Tractarian testimony, which Canon Overton, we know not why, has not quoted. Isaac Williams reports a saying of Keble's thus: 'Froude, you said one day that Law's

¹ *A Serious Call* (ed. 1888), Pref. p. 8.

² *Boswell*, i. 39, 514, iii. 379 (ed. Napier: 279 in Napier's index is an error).

Serious Call was a clever (or pretty, I forget which) book ; it seemed to me as if you had said the day of judgment would be a pretty sight.' That is to say, Keble felt a reverential awe for the book, and we are told that he used to read it and put it out of the way, hiding it in a drawer.¹ Elsewhere he says, 'Law's *Serious Call* is most admirable, but one must not quite swear by him, as he had sometimes a most curiously one-sided way of looking at a matter ; of which you will find an instance in his advising every person to sing aloud, in church and in his room, whether with or without voice and ear.'² Dr. Newman, after speaking of what he owed to Calvinistic teaching, adds that 'this main Catholic doctrine of the warfare between the city of God and the powers of darkness was also deeply impressed upon my mind by a work of a character very opposite to Calvinism, Law's *Serious Call*.'³ Mr. T. Mozley, indeed, says that, 'though Law's works generally were in great favour, with Froude at least, the *Serious Call*, the most entertaining of them, was never mentioned at Oriel in my time, to my recollection.'⁴ And again, speaking of Froude, he tells us that 'the writer most on his table and his tongue was the above-mentioned William Law.'⁵ Burgon says that Law's *Serious Call* was one of the three books always on the table of the dressing-room of Charles Lonquet Higgins, 'the good layman.'⁶ We may here refer to two or three appreciative notices of Law and his writings which have appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review*.⁷ It is only right to give due place to some of the exceptions which have been taken to the book, though they occasionally show that the objectors have failed to catch the real drift of the *Serious Call*, or have found themselves out of sympathy with the piety of its author, from difference of temperament or from deeper causes. It has been said, for instance (Pref. p. xii), that there is too little of the doctrines and facts of the Gospel narrative in the *Serious Call*, but this objection forgets that the gist of the book was that men did not live up to the faith which they professed, that they did not want more knowledge, but better practice, not a clearer intellectual grasp of doctrine. but consistency in acting up to its moral obligations. It has,

¹ *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*, p. 28, 2nd ed. Cf. Church's *Oxford Movement*, p. 25 (1st ed.).

² *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance*, p. 80 (ed. 1885).

³ *Apologia*, p. 6 (ed. 1887).

⁴ *Reminiscences*, i. 211.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 228.

⁶ *Twelve Good Men*, ii. 412.

⁷ *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1888, p. 255 ; July 1893, p. 495 ; October 1893, p. 193.

again
ration
tions
with
much
mine
anot
book
seem
Cano
to L
ship
Chu
wors
beca
will
from
to ex
odio
cata
own
tion
can
the
whic
happ
juro
read
is cl
it is
worl
finds
sent
in yo

1
2
called
Lectu
\$ 5, p
1898,
Excu

again, been said that the logical character of Law's mind is rather too prominent in a writing which appeals to the emotions rather than to the intellect. But as Canon Overton, with a deeper insight, observes, the *Serious Call* was not so much intended to rouse men's feelings as to convince their minds of the absurdity of doing one thing and believing another. And, again, severe objection has been taken to the book, or rather to one short passage in it, because it has seemed to make light of the obligation of public worship. Canon Overton gives one obvious answer to this by referring to Law's own practice of diligent attendance at public worship, and by observing that the *Serious Call* is addressed to Church-goers who did not order their life in accord with their worship (Pref. p. xiii). For the sake of completion, and not because we think that the objection is just or valuable, we will mention Mr. T. Mozley's remark: 'Perhaps I should say from memory that (the *Serious Call*) calls attention too much to externals, and thereby takes the form of caricature, at once odious and useless. It would enable anybody to ticket and catalogue his neighbours, rather than divest himself of his own follies.'¹ The book itself is the best answer to this objection, and to such as this. We venture to think that few men can read far into the *Serious Call* without being pierced in the joints of their harness, in some tender secret place of which others do not suspect the existence, and which, perhaps, the reader himself has forgotten, until that grave Non-juror has stirred a torpid conscience² into activity. You may read the book and think first that it is amusing, then that it is clever, then that it is penetrating in its sagacity, then that it is an excellent description of such and such an aspect of worldliness; but at last, without a moment's warning, the book finds you yourself, and your attention is riveted by a piercing sentence which strikes home into your very soul, and lodges in your mind, so that you cannot forget it or escape from it.

¹ *Reminiscences*, i. 211.

² On Conscience, 'that eye of God in the soul of man,' as St. Cadoc called it, 'that sixth sense by which God is apprehended' (Wace, *Boyle Lectures*, 1874-5, p. 203), see Newman's Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, § 5, p. 55; Canon Gore's lecture reported in the *Guardian*, December 7, 1898, pp. 1901-2; and Wordsworth, 'Despondency corrected,' in the *Excursion*, book iv:

'But above all, the victory is most sure
For him, who, seeking faith by virtue, strives
To yield entire submission to the law
Of conscience, conscience revered and obeyed
As God's most intimate presence in the soul,
And His most perfect image in the world.'

It becomes a 'Word of God' in your life; you perforce think of the inspired description of the Word of God as 'quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.'¹ The *Serious Call* thus finds you and makes a change in your life, as it has in the lives of a good many men in the generations which have gone before us. We will, therefore, betake ourselves to the contents of the book, and give first of all a general account of its materials and then some details by way of illustration.

Devotion, says Law in substance, extends to our whole life, and prayer is but a part of it. The reason why Christian people in general fall so far short of the holiness of the Christian character is that few of them have any intention of serving God altogether. Yet God expects every man's best, and the only way of pleasing Him is to do the whole work of life to His glory. A life of leisure means an increase of opportunity for serving God in a higher degree of special devotion. Estates and fortunes² afford opportunities for the exercise of godly wisdom and the discharge of religious obligations. Carelessness in these matters—the *securitas* of our Article, the *security* of Shakespeare—may not seem to the unhappy man whose heart is shrivelled by it to be what it really is, ridiculous as well as evil; but undoubtedly the careful use of possessions for good ends alone carries us towards perfection and true happiness. Self-denial and restraint, for example in apparel, are necessary, and this on the part of all men and women in their several degrees and circumstances. Life guided by such principles as these is filled with true and deep peace, and this can be proved, not only positively but negatively, by looking at the emptiness, the sensuality, and the absurdity of those who fashion their lives otherwise. Nay, more, the utmost regularity and diligence of a mere worldly life is in the end only vanity and vexation of spirit. Now, plainly such a life as is here described must be cultivated. It is a supernatural plant, and needs vigorous and continual attention. A man who aims at it will rise early to prayer, and remember that as he grows older his prayers must improve. Thanksgiving is to be regarded as an essential part of prayer. The uprooting of pride and the

¹ Heb. iv. 12.

² He gives three reasons why money should be well spent: (1) It enters so largely into life; (2) It is a means of doing good; (3) It is a means of immense harm if ill-spent (pp. 50-2).

cultivation of humility are to be aims of prayer, though these are directly opposed to the popular temper, boys being often trained in an unchristian spirit of emulation, and girls taught to love dress too much and to practise arts to the verge of immodesty. Further, love and intercession for all are binding on all. Our intercessions will help us in love and virtue. Finally, true prayer contains resignation to the will of God and confession of sin. How well these marks of prayer fit in with the ancient hours of prayer. Thanksgiving in the morning, humility at the third hour, intercession at noon, submission to the Divine will at the ninth hour, and confession at night. Surely a life of such devotion, thus made up of duty and prayer, is the best, the highest, the noblest life—is an imitation of the Perfect Life of the Incarnate Son.

Such is the outline of the *Serious Call*, a sketch, it may be said, which is taken from a careful analysis of each chapter, made many years ago when the present writer read the *Serious Call* day by day during the season of Lent, not for criticism, but for personal edification. On looking over it again it seems, as is natural under the circumstances of its composition, to give a fairly correct impression of the sobriety of the drift of the book, without conveying any idea of the shrewdness and humour of many passages. The wit of the book is truly delightful, and an attempt must be made to give some typical examples of it. First of all, there is the series of portraits by which Law points his lessons, a mode of writing which he had adopted in an earlier work, which had been previously employed by Steele and Addison, and was afterwards adopted by Johnson and Cowper, quite in harmony with the literary style of the eighteenth century. Canon Overton considers that the 'force and pungency' of Law's humour in these portraits are second to none (p. 3). There are more than a score of them, and they include Calidus, a worldly tradesman; Classicus, a scholar; Claudius, a man of figure and estate; Caecus, a proud man who does not know it; Caelia, who lives a disquiet life; Cognatus, a pluralist; Eugenius, an awakened young man; Eusebia, a widow who brought up her daughters piously; Eusebius, a professor of religion and worldly withal; Felicianus, a fashionable lady; Flatus, a fickle and restless man; Flavia, a worldly gossip; Fulvius, who shuns responsibilities; Julius, an inconsistent churchgoer; Leo, who does not so much as profess to be religious; Matilda, whose education of her daughters was faulty; Miranda, the holy sister of poor Flavia; Mundanus, who advanced in everything except devotion; Negotius, the

prosperous man of business ; Octavius, a learned worldling ; Ouranius, a holy priest ; Paternus, a Christian father ; Penitens, a busy tradesman ; Serena, a woman of leisure ; Succus, a glutton ; and Susurrus, a pious whisperer. One or two sentences will show what Law is at his best in the way of portraiture :—

'FLAVIA is very orthodox ; she talks warmly against heretics and schismatics, is generally at Church, and often at the Sacrament. She once commended a sermon that was against the pride and vanity of dress, and thought it was very just against Lucinda, whom she takes to be a great deal finer than she needs to be. . . . Flavia would be a miracle of piety if she were but half so careful of her soul as she is of her body. . . . I shall not take upon me to say that it is impossible for Flavia to be saved ; but thus much must be said, that she has no grounds from Scripture to think she is in the way of salvation. . . . She has as much reason to think that she has been a sentinel in an army as that she has lived in watching and self-denial' (pp. 61-4).

'COGNATUS is a sober, regular clergyman of good repute in the world, and well esteemed in his parish. All his parishioners say he is an honest man, and very notable at making a bargain. The farmers listen to him with great attention when he talks of the properest time of selling corn. He has been for twenty years a diligent observer of markets, and has raised a considerable fortune by good management. Cognatus is very orthodox and full of esteem of our English liturgy, and if he has not prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays, it is because his predecessor had not used the parish to any such custom. . . . Cognatus has no other end in growing rich but that he may leave a considerable fortune to a niece whom he has politely educated in expensive finery by what he has saved out of the tithes of two livings' (pp. 133-4).

A man who could write like this was severe and uncompromising, but Canon Overton will not have it that he was hard and morose, and the tenderness of the address of Paternus to his little son, which is too long to be quoted, shows a very touching glimpse of Law's heart (pp. 209-16). We must select at random a few detached sentences from all parts of the work.

'It is as possible for a man to worship a crocodile, and yet be a pious man, as to have his affections set upon this world and yet be a good Christian' (p. 9).

'There is nothing noble in a clergyman but a burning zeal for the salvation of souls, nor anything poor in his profession but idleness and a worldly spirit' (p. 13).

'Clergymen must live wholly unto God in one particular way, that is in the exercise of holy offices, in the ministration of prayer and sacraments, and a zealous distribution of spiritual goods. But

men
oblig
their
oblig

been
our m

'A
advan

rule, a

higher

'I
becom

exclud
seek t

'V
breath
humil

'I
upon

and n
must

the su

'I
that C

'T
rightly

is the
earth'

N

the S

forma

stirred

in the

the R

¹ P
who of

and Ev
from w

are clo
² S

³ H
sin, an

oppose
quite a

⁴ T
'an hu
Overto

men of other employments are in their particular ways as much obliged to act as the servants of God, and live wholly unto Him in their several callings. This is the only difference (*i.e.* in moral obligation) between clergymen and people of other callings' (p. 30).

'When we are as pious as Jews and heathens of all ages have been we shall think it proper to pray at the beginning and end of our meals' (p. 42).

'Any one pious regularity of any one part of our life is of great advantage, not only on its own account, but as it uses us to live by rule, and think of the government of ourselves' (p. 66).¹

'Tenderness of affection to the most abandoned sinners is the highest instance of a divine and God-like soul' (p. 72).

'Let us but intend to see and hear, and then the whole world becomes a book of instruction unto us all' (p. 131).²

'The privacy of fasting does not suppose such a privacy as excludes everybody from knowing it, but such a privacy as does not seek to be known abroad' (p. 176).

'We may as well think to see without eyes, or live without breath, as to live in the spirit of religion without the spirit of humility' (p. 183).³

'Let a man when he is most delighted with his own figure look upon a crucifix, and contemplate our blessed Lord stretched out and nailed upon a cross; and then let him consider how absurd it must be for a heart full of pride and vanity to pray to God through the sufferings of such a meek and crucified Saviour' (p. 187).

'If I hate or despise any one man in the world I hate something that God cannot hate, and despise that which He loves' (p. 248).

'There is nothing wise or great or noble in a human spirit but rightly to know and heartily worship and adore the great God, that is the true support and life of all spirits, whether in heaven or on earth' (p. 309).⁴

No one who is personally acquainted with the contents of the *Serious Call*, or who knows as a matter of literary information what various kinds of men have been deeply stirred and even changed by it, can deny its right to a place in the series of 'The English Theological Library,' edited by the Rev. F. Relton and supplied with a General Introduction

¹ Perhaps this sentence may catch the eye of one of those clergymen who offer paltry excuses from time to time for the neglect of daily Matins and Evensong. A bishop's visitation Charge for 1898 lies before us, from which it appears that two out of every three churches in the diocese are closed from Sunday to Sunday.

² So reads Canon Overton; but the edition of 1888 omits 'all.'

³ He names three grounds for humility: man's weakness, misery, and sin, and two causes which make its practice difficult: (1) the world is opposed to it, (2) our very training in youth has been often conducted in quite another spirit.

⁴ These are the last words of the treatise. The edition of 1888 says 'an human,' and differs in a few other slight readings from Canon Overton's text.

by the Lord Bishop of London. The general account of the book which we have just given, and the representative quotations which we have made from it, will, we trust, lead the most fastidious reader to give a verdict in favour of including the *Serious Call* in such a series, and incline him to read the whole work. The advertisement of the series informs us that it is intended to issue either complete editions or selected portions of the writings of the principal English theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with introductions and notes, so as to be of real service to students, and especially to those preparing for University or Ordination examinations. The headings of the series are 'Dogmatic,' 'Historical,' 'Homiletical,' and 'Exegetical,' and among the books already selected are, in addition to the present work, Bishop Wilson's *Maxims of Piety and Christianity*, the fifth book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Butler's *Analogy and Sermons*, Jewel's *Apology*, Laud's *Controversy with Fisher*, and Whichcote's *Aphorisms*. Some of these hardly come within the range of University or Ordination examination, and are selected, we presume, for a wider field of students. Dr. Creighton's General Introduction deserves to be read thoughtfully on several accounts: for its remarks on theology in general as a science which 'is concerned with setting forth the truth of God as He has revealed it in His Word to His Church'; for its insistence on the mutual illumination of theology and history; for its clear description of the objects of the 'English Theological Library'; and for its acute perception of the features of the best English theology. We must not quote more from it than its concluding paragraph:

'The strenuous pursuit of truth, sobriety, high thoughts, commanding power of expression—these are great qualities. They are all to be found in the books which are to be issued in this series. Introductions and notes will serve to bridge over the gulf which must always to some degree separate the thought of the past from the thought of the present. It is better to read one great book than a series of little books. It is better to seek for the truth where its issues were most seriously felt than to rest content with tabulated arguments in its favour. Theological students will profit by contact with great minds. It is for their guidance especially that this series is designed. They would gain in power to face the problems of our own time if they were better acquainted with the great heritage of the past, and were animated by the same spirit as their predecessors, whose lot was cast in no less difficult days' (Pref. p. viii).

If Capon Overton has erred in his preface to the *Serious Call*, and in his view of the length and number of the notes necessary for the elucidation of the text, it has been on the

side
giv
lect
forg
say
sho
of
refr
goo
did
the
leac
valu
phr
ease
inst
cha
hou
the
of l
exp
' soc
gree
whic
been
num
157
(p. 1
unin
sang
note
port
diffi
adva

1

2

3

4

with
of 'T
to the
and 1
p. 170

5

6

214, 2
centu

side of brevity. It is true that Canon Overton has already given us his life of Law,¹ and has, moreover, been recently lecturing and preaching at King's Cliffe,² and we do not forget that we ourselves have praised Law's forcible style by saying that he does not need a commentator.³ Though short, the preface really contains all that is essential by way of introduction to the *Serious Call*, and Canon Overton refrains from following Law into his mystic stage for the good reason that his strange attraction to Jacob Behmen did not in the least affect his adherence to the principles or the mode of life recommended in this treatise.⁴ The two leading features of the Notes, which give them very great value, are, that the history and also the peculiar words and phrases of the eighteenth century are discussed with the ease and fulness of a good scholar. We could give many instances, but a few must suffice. Such are the notes on charity schools (pp. 35, 64), labourer's wages (p. 72), coffee-houses (p. 125), coaching (p. 192), the 'lesser gentry' (p. 43), the Italian opera (p. 120),⁵ running footmen (*ibid.*), the dress of Methodists (p. 77), the salary of curates (p. 134), the rare expression of belief in the Real Presence (p. 268), united 'societies' (p. 85), the prevalence of swearing (p. 11), and greed (p. 34), and popular Protestantism (p. 45).⁶ The words which have changed their meaning, or by careless use have been emptied of their proper sense, since Law's day are very numerous, such as reason (p. 2), impertinent (pp. 3, 33, 90, 157), taste of (p. 7), figure (p. 12), painful (p. 34), careful (p. 105), passion (pp. 156, 291), antic as an adjective (p. 166), uninclined (p. 181), amusing (p. 184), emulation (p. 205), sanguine (p. 221), retire (p. 237), ingenuity (p. 301). Some notes there are which add to the completeness of Law's portrait, as one who attempted to grapple with the moral difficulties of Holy Scripture (p. 293), or who was much in advance of his own age (pp. 296, 306), or who studied non-

¹ See the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 23, p. 309.

² The *Church Times*, October 28, 1898, p. 495.

³ The *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 73, p. 195.

⁴ The present writer possesses a copy of Quesnel's *New Testament with Reflections* (ed. 1719), with a list of subscribers, including the name of 'The reverend Mr. William Law.' This illustrates Law's attraction to the Quietists two years after the publication of the letters to Hoadly, and nine years before the *Serious Call*. See Canon Overton's note, p. 170.

⁵ Cf. note on p. 84.

⁶ Cf. pp. 89, 92, 107, 109, 126, 128, 129, 134, 143, 159, 163, 183, 203, 214, 246, for many very interesting pieces of information about eighteenth-century Evangelicalism.

juring Scotch divines (p. 296), or who totally disagreed with the philosophy of Locke (p. 109). Another very interesting note is that in which Canon Overton conclusively demonstrates that we must not accept too literally the remark of Gibbon that Flavia and Miranda are portraits of his two aunts (p. 59). Unless a reader knows enough Church history himself to form some estimate of the popular ignorance which prevails, though we hope that it is decreasing, he will perhaps think that it was unnecessary to put a note to Law's allusion to 'the great St. Austin' to explain that the Bishop of Hippo and not the first Archbishop of Canterbury is intended (p. 134). There are some passages on which notes would have been welcome, though Canon Overton has passed them over. Such a passage is that about the sluggard who remembers his warm bed all the day, and is glad when he is not one of those that sit *starving* in a church. This use of 'starving' for being cold should have been commented upon, and the north-country word 'clammed,' for being very hungry, should have been given. A well-known phrase from Virgil about sleep is quoted twice over: 'consanguineus lethi' on p. 182, and 'Leti' on p. 297, the reference given (vi. 278) being right in the second case and wrong in the first. The well-known quotation from Ovid about 'video meliora' is called 'the Horatian rule,' and is given without a reference (Pref. p. xi).¹ These are small matters, but one larger omission we cannot but regret. It is that Canon Overton has not met the objection made to the *Serious Call*, that there is too little of the Gospel in it, by setting forth in full what is the true and ample answer—namely, a list of the passages in the treatise which allude to particular incidents or sayings in the Gospel narrative. It does not seem to have struck even Canon Overton himself that they are much more numerous than is commonly supposed. To repeat them all would be to transcribe a very large number of passages from the book, and they are so numerous that any reader can find many of them for himself in any part of the work. But as a sample of the Gospel basis of this moral treatise we may just mention the Evangelical allusions in the portraits of Flavia and Miranda. Flavia's life is condemned as being 'in direct opposition to all those tempers and practices which the Gospel has made necessary to salvation.' She is contrasted with Anna the prophetess, and brought face to face

¹ Ovid, *Met.* vii. 21. Canon Overton will recollect that Bishop Wordsworth (on Rom. vii. 15) quotes both this passage and Euripides, *Medea*, 1074.

wit
as
of
self
pas
des
wor
kin
sup
she
in'
he
bos
our
rece
our
expr
it q
said
whil
myst
of th
prev
buyi
are b
it wi
satisf
Over
as it
he wa
he a
Conve

1 S
on Ch
book,
des P
It is al
word:
from th
(5 and
for abo

with the precept about striving to enter in at the strait gate, as she has not made 'any one doctrine of the Gospel a rule of her life.' The imitation of our Saviour, watching and self-denial, are mentioned in terms which recall definite passages in the Gospels to the mind (pp. 63-4). The description of Miranda opens with an allusion to our Lord's words about the one thing needful; her charity is of that kind which is received as done to Christ Himself; she supposes herself at the feet of our Saviour and His Apostles; she recollects the words 'I was a stranger and ye took Me in'; she considers that Lazarus was a common beggar, that he was the care of angels, and carried into Abraham's bosom; that God sends sunshine and showers on all; that our Saviour said that it was more blessed to give than to receive (pp. 68 75). In an important though brief note on our Lord's atoning sacrifice we wish that Canon Overton had expressed himself with a little more fulness, so as to make it quite clear that there is a true sense in which it can be said that our Lord died in our stead and as our substitute, while that and all other solitary aspects of a complex mystery must be protected and qualified by the recollection of the rest (p. 196). We fear that straitened means will prevent many who desire to read the *Serious Call* from buying this last edition of it, in days when 6,000 benefices are below 200*l.* a year in value. But those who can afford it will certainly find it a very worthy edition, and it is a satisfaction to all who are under deep obligation to Canon Overton as an historical scholar to know that when he stood, as it were, with this volume fresh from the press in his hands, he was selected by the members of the Capitular body which he adorns to be their Proctor in the Lower House of Convocation.¹

¹ See the *Guardian*, December 7, 1898, p. 1881. An elaborate work on Christian Morals which may be mentioned in connexion with Law's book, and one which appears to be very little known, is *La Bibliothèque des Prédicateurs*, by Father Houdry, S.J. (Liège, 1716, 4 vols. folio). It is alphabetically arranged, and there are six 'paragraphs' under each word: (1) Sermon schemes; (2) Patristic works on the subject; (3) Texts from the Bible with applications; (4) Scattered references in the Fathers; (5 and 6) Extracts from theological writers. The work can be procured for about thirty shillings.

ART. XI.—THOMAS AND MATTHEW ARNOLD.

Thomas and Matthew Arnold, and their Influence on English Education. By SIR JOSHUA FITCH, M.A., LL.D., formerly Her Majesty's Inspector of Training Colleges. 'Great Educators' Series. (London, 1897).

IF Thomas and Matthew Arnold had not happened to be father and son, it is not likely that it would have occurred to anyone to link their names together. Given the relationship, it is possible, no doubt, to discern points of contact and resemblance. Both may be classed as educationalists by those who like to use that cumbrous and unpleasing word. Both were deeply interested in the intellectual culture of their fellow-countrymen. Both thought and wrote much on religious questions. Both strove to enlarge the ideas of the public to which they severally addressed themselves; and both seemed, in respect of this part of their work, to be but *voces clamantium in deserto*. But, in spite of these points of resemblance, the differences are great, and are not confined to the surface only, but rather extend deep down into the foundations of their lives. Not only were the spheres in which they worked, the audiences to which they spoke, markedly different, but the temperaments and characters of the two men differed profoundly. The one enthusiastic, vigorous, powerful, sympathetic, speaking to the character and the emotions; the other critical, cynical, sarcastic, humorous, and addressing himself primarily to reason and the intellect: assuredly the tie of natural relationship is needed to group them in our minds together. Yet grouped they are, necessarily; and it was inevitable that an editor who had to deal with the great educators of the world, with a special reference to the English book-buying public, should apportion one volume to the consideration of the work of Thomas and Matthew Arnold.

For such a task Sir Joshua Fitch has strong qualifications, from his official experience of modern English educational methods and history, and from his personal acquaintance with Matthew Arnold, his colleague in the service of the Education Department. His book, if not remarkable, is at any rate adequate and readable; strongest, as was to be expected, in dealing with purely educational matters, weaker on purely literary topics, such as the poetry and literary criticism of Matthew Arnold, or the historical work of his father. He

is n
tain
Lat
such
at
stim
side
blen

sket
fortu
phie
as h
treat
It is
each
done
mine
unpr
men
intell

I
Arno
publ
but t
quest
the f
but i
tially
Winc
a typ
affect
limita
and e
Wyke
sector
stitute
and it
is of n
not in
ties an
ter. T
respon
the rec
midshi

is not afraid to indicate his own differences of opinion on certain educational matters, such as Thomas Arnold's views on Latin verse, or Matthew's methods of school inspection ; and such criticisms, whether the reader agrees with them or not, at least serve the purpose of arousing his attention and stimulating thought on matters which are sometimes of considerable importance to those who are interested in the problems of modern education.

It would be superfluous to attempt to write a biographical sketch of the life of Thomas Arnold, who has had the good fortune to be the subject of one of the few first-rate biographies in the English language ; while Matthew Arnold's life, as he himself felt, was not of a kind to lend itself to historical treatment, the external events in it being few and unimportant. It is possible, however, to attempt to sum up the work which each of them did, and to estimate the spirit in which it was done ; and at a time when education is one of the most prominent subjects and foremost needs of the day, it may be unprofitable to consider the thoughts and achievements of two men who have left their marks deep on the educational and intellectual characteristics of the present generation.

If the average educated man is asked what Thomas Arnold did, he will probably answer that he reformed the public school system through his headmastership of Rugby ; but this answer, though it would not much mislead the average questioner, is in strict accuracy quite erroneous. It was not the form of the public school system that Arnold modified, but its spirit. In form the system of Rugby was substantially that under which he had himself been educated at Winchester. Winchester has always been in many respects a typical public school, conservative in its traditions, unaffected by special social distinctions, unfettered by special limitations of class, and possessing an exceptionally vigorous and enduring corporate spirit ; and Arnold was not only a Wykehamist, but a keen and devoted Wykehamist. The prefectorial system, the recognition of fagging by properly constituted boy authorities, was well established at Winchester, and it was the foundation of Arnold's system at Rugby, as it is of nearly all public schools at the present day. Arnold did not invent the thing, but he developed its inherent possibilities and made it a powerful engine in the formation of character. There are few more potent educational agents than responsibility ; and England, as a nation, owes enormously to the recognition of this principle. It is this that makes the midshipmen in our navy and the subalterns in our army

capable, not merely of those astonishing feats which some of them from time to time have the luck and the ability to achieve, but of that high average of responsible work which is done, unrecognized, from day to day throughout the services. The same qualities may be seen, by those who care to look for them, in much of our civil life, though in many careers the opportunities for showing them are less; and it is impossible to estimate how much of the stronger elements of our national character is due to that early cultivation of responsibility of which the prefectorial system in our public schools is one of the most notable manifestations. Arnold trusted his boys; and the result was that they rarely abused the trust. It was often said, especially at Oxford—to which university most of his boys went—that his scholars were unduly serious and oppressed with a sense of their importance in the universe; but this is a fault which is not likely to affect any very large proportion of English schoolboys, and if in the hands of an exceptional master the bow was over strongly bent in this direction, the excess was of a kind which would not be found under more ordinary circumstances.

As with the social organization of the school, so with its more strictly educational system, Arnold did not so much reform as re-inspirit. He found, and on the whole he maintained, at Rugby the normal public school curriculum, in which Latin and Greek occupy the foremost post, with history and divinity as recognized adjuncts, while mathematics, modern languages, and especially science, are relegated to comparatively obscure situations. We have no intention of discussing the merits or the demerits of the system here. Sir Joshua Fitch does indeed take the opportunity to deliver his soul in a denunciation of verse composition as a means of education; but though we wholly disagree with him, and note with satisfaction that Arnold's experience led him from a dislike of verse composition to an increasing belief in it,¹ we will not argue the point here, nor try to appraise the comparative value of the testimony of Dean Farrar (whom Sir Joshua Fitch quotes) and Arnold on educational problems. The point which we wish to make at present is this, that Arnold took over the existing educational system in the main, but filled it with fresh life by his methods and his individual personality. In all his teaching he was thinking, not of the accumulation of exact knowledge, but of the effect on the boy's mind and character. Not merely the divinity lesson, the special charm and force of which have been so admirably

¹ *Thomas and Matthew Arnold*, p. 42.

se
mo
min
His
him
and
was
met
tion
teac
unc
app
taug
at p
I
char
that
sym
that
out
a hig
have
impr
his p
speci
of the
litera
Hug
name
rally
meth
may
publi
the g
as the
guage
questi
spirit
good.
Bu
chair
ration.
with s
ford, it
interes

set forth by Dean Stanley, but the classical lesson, and still more the history lesson, were used to impress on his pupils' minds the great moral teachings of the world's experience. His sympathy with human character made him realize for himself the human interest in ancient literature and history, and enabled him to convey that interest to his hearers. He was among the first of English scholars to adopt the realistic methods of Niebuhr, which may be taken to be the foundation of the whole of the modern system of reading and teaching history ; and it was, no doubt, the human, natural, unconventional character of those methods that primarily appealed to him. He felt ancient history as real life, and he taught it for its bearings upon human character. He aimed at producing, not specialists, but men.

Here, indeed, is the secret of Arnold's method. It was character that he aimed at producing, and it was by character that he worked. Freshness, vigour, strenuousness, honesty, sympathy were the notes of his character, and it was by them that he impressed his pupils. Other teachers have turned out exacter scholars, and have trained their pupils' minds to a higher stage of intellectual development ; but few, if any, have possessed his power of at once stimulating the mind and impressing the soul. Hence it was that he put his mark upon his pupils with a peculiar clearness, and inspired them with a special devotion to himself ; and the literary genius of two of these pupils, in adding two imperishable works to English literature (Dean Stanley's *Life of Arnold* and Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays*), has carried Arnold's name and fame into wider circles than a schoolmaster generally reaches, and thereby has made his spirit and his method a part and parcel of modern public school life. It may be uncertain how far the modern developments of our public schools are due to Arnold's influence, and how far to the general march of ideas ; and some features of them, such as the increasing attention paid to science and modern languages, lay altogether outside his sphere. But it cannot be questioned that his influence, especially upon the tone and spirit of the schools was great ; and the whole of it was good.

But it was not only in school and from the headmaster's chair that Arnold brought his influence to bear on his generation. Himself a Fellow of Oriel at the same time as Keble, with strong connexions of tradition and sentiment with Oxford, it was impossible that he should not take the keenest interest in the great religious movement which was convulsing

Oxford and England during the years of his headmastership of Rugby; and when his spirit was strongly moved, he was sure to throw himself strenuously into the conflict. The form which his participation in the controversy took was due to the idiosyncrasies of his character. He had left Oxford too soon, and was too independent in character, to fall wholly under the influence of Newman or Pusey; and his temperament led him in a different direction. Looking always to spirit rather than to form, sympathising with other men so greatly that he would always rather include than reject, his tendency naturally was to plead for the widest possible toleration of divergent opinions. The Church of England should be as nearly as possible identical with the nation of England, embracing all who could honestly claim the name of Christian. That was the only test, but that test was to be applied rigidly. With Unitarians he would make no terms. He would have had no sympathy with those who to-day assert that they have a right to call themselves Christians because, though rejecting Christ's Divinity, they yet hold Him in reverence as a human teacher. That quibble Arnold would have rejected without hesitation; but he made little account of the principles by which Christians are divided from one another. The result was that, at a time when nearly all men who took a living interest in religious matters were eagerly debating questions of Church history and patristic teaching and theological interpretation, he stood on an eminence by himself, satisfying neither party and influencing few except those who, as his pupils, came directly under his influence. Neither the Oxford High Church school, nor those who regarded that school as drawing dangerously near to Popery, could regard him as otherwise than unsound in his principles; and the greater the energy with which he intervened in the conflict, the more sure he was to draw down blows on himself from both sides.

So, in religion as in education, Arnold founded no new system, but was the prophet of a true and life-giving spirit. With few disciples to follow exactly in his footsteps, he was yet helpful and stimulative to all with whom he came into contact. If his educational methods required enlargement, so as to include a wider range of subjects, and if his religious teaching required to be guided by a sounder grasp of Church principles, the spirit which inspired both was healthy and true; and the reverence in which his name is held to this day, and will be held to a distant future, is fully and honourably deserved. Not Winchester only, which educated him, nor

Rugby, which he educated, nor even all the public schools whom his example influenced so deeply, but all cultivated members of the English-speaking peoples throughout the world, are proud to acknowledge the greatness of soul which inspired Thomas Arnold, and the debt which they owe to his generous spirit and upright manliness of character.

When all that knew him cherished his memory, it was natural that his own family should do so most of all; and Matthew Arnold's recently published letters bear constant testimony to his devotion to his father's memory. Yet in passing to the consideration of the son's career one cannot help feeling oneself surrounded by a wholly different atmosphere. The difference is partly one of circumstances, but it is still more one of temperament and character. Having been, in the first instance, sent to Winchester, like his father before him, he was removed thence when his father went to Rugby, and thenceforward lived at home, receiving practically the education of a day-boarder. Possibly this amount of separation from the common life of a school had something to do with the aloofness which characterised him afterwards; possibly, too, the uncongenial character of his work in later life contributed to the same end. While his father's lot had fallen in a great public school, his own was cast in an Inspectorship of elementary education among schools especially patronized by Nonconformists. He did his work honestly and adequately, but (as Sir Joshua Fitch regretfully admits) he never regarded it with that enthusiasm which a properly constituted Inspector of Schools should feel. He looked upon it as bread-and-butter work, necessary to him as a father of a family, but not affording scope to his special and proper powers. But behind these differences of circumstances there lay also a difference of temperament which was fostered by them—a temperament intellectual rather than emotional, and critical rather than enthusiastic.

Given, then, this temperament, intellectual rather than emotional; given, too, these uncongenial, or but half-congenial, circumstances, which dulled enthusiasm and encouraged criticism; and given in addition the reaction from religious and theological excitement which characterized the generation following that of the Oxford Movement, we can fairly account for the lines upon which Matthew Arnold's genius developed itself. Like his father, he tried to educate his generation, but his aims and his methods were different. While his father endeavoured to touch men's hearts and elevate their characters, he aimed at touching their minds and widening their intellects.

His method was sarcasm, not enthusiasm. His watchword was culture, not religion.

On his official work as an Inspector of Schools it is not necessary to say much. There have probably been many better inspectors; and the best of his work was probably due to the fact that he was not only an inspector. His reputation as a scholar, a critic, and a man of letters, gave weight to his recommendations on all matters touching the intellectual development of educational methods, and also (as Sir Joshua Fitch points out) gave a pleasant stimulus to many managers and masters of schools whom he met in his official progresses. He was always averse to Procrustean systems of examination and reward (a characteristically Arnoldian feature), and was constantly on the look-out for opportunities to inculcate a wider literary culture into the children under his charge. He advocated (without much success) increased reading of the Bible, not as religious instruction but as literature. Further, he was more than once despatched on missions to the Continent, to report on foreign educational methods, of which his love of French intellectual characteristics and his distaste for contemporary English Philistinism made him a sympathetic student; and his reports of these missions contain much that is interesting and suggestive, though we do not know that they have left much impression on the educational policy of English governments. But the greater part of his official work bulks no larger in his life's achievement than the folios filled by Charles Lamb at the India House. Like his father, he had interests outside his profession to which he devoted his spare time; but, unlike his father, it was in these outside occupations that his greatest work was done.

The literary work of Matthew Arnold falls into three, if not four, divisions. There is what may be called his didactic work, part of which may be described as his teaching on religion, while the other part is his teaching on culture. Next, there is his work in the sphere of literary criticism; and finally, there is his poetry. Of his writings on the subject of religion it is not necessary to say much. That he was earnest in his desire for the good of humanity is unquestionable, but the trace that he left upon either his contemporaries or his successors in this respect was small. His father had passed through a long and severe struggle with doubt, but had emerged victorious, and could thenceforth throw all his vigorous enthusiasm into the cause of Christianity. Whether the son struggled with doubt we know not, but it is certain that doubt was victorious; and his teaching was in the name

of a God whom he knew only as 'a stream of tendency, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness,' not a God revealed to us in Christ. This in itself weakened his position as a religious teacher; but it may be doubted whether, with his somewhat reserved and critical temperament, he could ever have exercised a wide influence in this direction. He could not speak to the emotions, he could only arouse the intellect; and it was in his appeals to the intellect, in his efforts to purify the taste and enlarge the culture of the English public that he was most truly and effectively a teacher.

It may be doubted whether, even in the sixties and early seventies, the taste of England was so low as Matthew Arnold habitually represented it, or its vulgarity so blatant and self-satisfied. It must be remembered that, before the passing of the Education Act, his work lay wholly among schools supported by the Nonconformist bodies, the managers of whom were, presumably, mostly Nonconformists; and this was hardly a sphere in which Arnold was likely to find many congenial spirits. Hence his continual warfare against Dissent, not *qua* religious Dissent, but on account of its intellectual barrenness, its narrowness, and its want of culture. But it would be useless to contend that this is the whole explanation of the matter. At no time could the average taste of a large and very busy community reach the standard of taste and culture which Arnold desiderated; but the England of thirty years ago fell very short of that ideal indeed. A reader who will take advantage of the recent reprint of that most characteristically Arnoldian *jeu d'esprit*, long so inaccessible, *Friendship's Garland*, cannot but feel that many of Arnold's gibes have lost much of their weight to-day. But if this is true—if the strivings after culture are to-day more genuine and more wide-spread; if the standard of popular taste has been raised above the level of early Victorian days—the credit is in no small measure due to Matthew Arnold himself. Not, of course, to him alone. Other workers, such as Ruskin among his seniors, Hunt, Burne-Jones, Morris, Rossetti, Pater, among his coevals and juniors, were in their own different spheres labouring in the same direction and incurring the same opposition and ridicule as he met with. But however much his catchwords—his 'Philistines' and 'Barbarians,' his 'sweetness and light'—were scoffed at, the phrases stuck, as he intended, and some impression was made on the well-nigh impenetrable hide of British self-complacency. It is not merely self-flattery to say that intellectual interests are more widely diffused now than before Arnold wrote; nor

is the change wholly a gain. If culture is more diffused, it is also less concentrated, and in literary achievement of the highest order the present generation compares but poorly with the last. Still, for the public at large the gain is clear. More good books are read, more good pictures are studied, more good music is listened to, than was the case a generation ago; and if it is the case that much of this apparently cultured interest is a sham, it is clearly a gain that fashion should require an appearance of refinement and good taste rather than an appearance of vulgarity and indifference.

In the intervals of his 'puny warfare against the Philistines,' of his attempts 'to pull out a few more stops in that powerful, but at present somewhat narrow-toned organ, the modern Englishman,' Arnold found time for many excursions into literary criticism, wherein he set an example of that culture which he would fain inculcate on his contemporaries. If one is asked for the most salient characteristic of his literary criticism (and in this brief notice we have no space for more), it would seem to be his constant insistence upon a high standard of taste. He tries to rise above temporary and superficial qualities, and to test everything by certain supreme canons, valid for all time. He asks of this poet and of that, Has he the 'grand style'?—of the translator of Homer, Has he rapidity, plainness and directness of style and thought, and nobleness of soul?—of the critic, Has he sweetness and light? The grand style in creative literature, lucidity in criticism: these were his ideals, which he was never weary of preaching. His criticisms of other writers have a way of abiding by one, because he cultivated this lucidity himself, and because he had the gift of arranging his study of an author round some central feature or idea, which is imprinted on the memory by the way in which it is handled and enforced from all sides. It was this love of lucidity that gave him his admiration for the French school of literary prose, with its clear logical arrangement and precision of phrase, and especially for Sainte-Beuve, the most clear-sighted, suggestive, and withal sane of critics. The sensationalism which tries to get a hearing by forced novelties of phrase or idea, which takes but one side of a truth and distorts that, never appealed to him. His judgment was sober and 'of the centre,' yet by his manner of expressing it, by the illuminating gift of apposite phrase and suggestive thoughts, he avoided monotony and commonplace. Culture of mind, lucidity of phrase, went hand in hand for him; and like Chaucer's parish priest,

'He taughte, but first he folwed it himselve.'

And finally, Arnold was a poet, and a poet in a generation which reached a very high level of poetic production. The Victorian age may not have so many names of the first rank as the Georgian, which can bring into the field such giants as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Byron, and Scott; but a generation which can claim Tennyson, the Brownings, Arnold, Swinburne, and William Morris, may hold up its head with the best. Among this distinguished gathering Arnold has a well defined position of his own. Without the beauty and charm of Tennyson, the force and dramatic power of Browning, the extraordinary rhythmical mastery of Swinburne, he excels them all in what may be called intellectual poetry. The grave meditative solemnity of such poems as *Obermann* and the *Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse* and *Rugby Chapel* touches notes such as few poets have reached, due to a peculiar combination of intellectual culture and genuine poetic feeling. His poetry always has the tincture of intellect, of meditation, of deliberate and studied art; but it would not be so impressive as it is if there were not a genuine spirit of poetry at the back of it, a sense of beauty (seen perhaps most clearly in certain stanzas of *Thyrsis* and *The Scholar Gipsy*) and an insight into the springs of thought and character which make their possessor a poet. The 'Spirit of Intellectual Beauty' whom Shelley invoked must surely have been the Muse whom Arnold served; and, in consequence, his disciples and admirers must always be drawn from those who have had some intellectual and literary training. But among these (and the class is not a very narrow one) he will find a train of followers, at least so long as the problems with which he deals exercise the human mind. On the minor poets of the younger generation his influence is marked and unmistakeable; and many readers, in times of intellectual unrest, will turn to him for sympathy and congenial companionship when a greater poet would help them less.

Mr. Hutton once singled out Matthew Arnold as the typical representative of that Oxford generation which followed the generation of Newman. The turbulent excitement of religious controversy had given place to an intellectual questioning of all things, to an attitude of doubt which was not merely a fashion, though in some cases it degenerated into that. It was a natural reaction, and has itself in turn given way to the combination of High Church views with critical scholarship which characterizes the Oxford of to-day. Possibly Clough is a fairer representative of it than Arnold:

Clough, with his paroxysms of doubt and blind gropings after faith, with his struggle of the soul in hope against the insistent whisperings of the intellect. The Olympian, if melancholy, serenity of Arnold marks the older man rather than the youth. He stands rather aloof from his generation, girding at its vulgarity, striving somewhat hopelessly to elevate its standards, teaching it by his example in literary criticism, and from time to time retiring into himself to commune with his soul in verse. His father taught his generation by a sympathetic mingling with it, stimulating it by his own enthusiasm and generous championship of right; the son taught his later generation as it were from outside, more by his example than by his exhortations. But both left their marks on the England of their day; and if in any respect we have advanced in the tone of our public school education, in a sympathetic and tolerant view of human nature and of religious controversy, in a wider range of intellectual interests, in a higher standard of taste in art and literature, we owe not a little of it to the advocacy and the example of Thomas and Matthew Arnold.

ART. XII.—THE TWO ARCHBISHOPS ON RECENT CONTROVERSIES.

1. *Charge delivered at his First Visitation.* By FREDERICK, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. (London, 1898.)
2. *The Present Distress.* An Advent Pastoral Letter addressed to the Clergy of his Diocese. By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. (London and York, 1898.)

SINCE the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury, though delivered before the publication of the October number of this *Review*, was not completed until after we had gone to press, we have not been able to give it sooner that attention which is claimed both by the contents of the Charge itself and by the position and character of its author. And, as a Pastoral Letter was issued by the Archbishop of York shortly before Christmas, this necessary delay has made it possible for us to refer in the same article to the utterances of both Archbishops.

To understand the meaning and appreciate the significance of the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury, it is necessary to remember that, while any authoritative cha-

racter it may possess extends only to the diocese of Canterbury, it is an official declaration of the official Head of the Church in England. As such, it naturally emphasizes strongly the value of the Book of Common Prayer. In an utterance of this kind, indeed, the Primate of All England could hardly refer otherwise to the authorized formularies of the English Church. But for those who, like ourselves, recognize in the completion of the Reformation revision of the services of the Church of England in 1662 the over-ruling hand of the Providence of God, it is a matter for respectful gratitude to be able to observe that the language used by the Archbishop about the Prayer Book—which, we notice with great satisfaction, he dates, not from the sixteenth century, but from 1662—is evidently far more than a mere official declaration, and betrays a warmth of feeling the expression of which he is often careful to suppress :

‘If we think,’ he says, ‘of deserting our Prayer Book, let us but remember how much this Church of ours has owed to it during the last two hundred years—how it has steadied us, animated us, held us in the true track. Has it not been the means of reviving our energies when we had fallen into slackness? Has it not seemed to answer to our call when we longed for more inspiring worship than we had been accustomed to? I believe that we could not find anything better suited to the genius of the English nation, anything more sure to make us grow in devotion and in that sober enthusiasm which is our special characteristic, anything which will more effectively bring men such as we are to love God in our deep but undemonstrative fashion. I pray with all my heart that we shall not undervalue the great blessing that God has bestowed upon us in giving us that book, and I pray that we shall be very slow to press our own opinions, however earnestly we hold them, in such a way as to lower that book in the eyes of our people and in our own eyes’ (pp. 38-9).

It is fitting that on the subject of the value of the Prayer Book and on that of the needs of the English nation the Archbishop should allow his personal judgment to be manifest. Elsewhere, he is careful to maintain the official character of what he has to say. For instance, in his treatment of the Eucharist, he explains the different forms of teaching which he believes to be lawful in the Church of England; he does not say what his own belief is. While he points out some of the dangers and some of the advantages of Confession, he expresses no opinion as to the proportion of instances in which Confession ought to be used. Thus, he speaks from the point of view, not of a teacher explaining his own mind, but of the Head of a national Church declaring to his own diocese what is lawful or unlawful within the

limits of that Church, and therefore from the standpoint of 'the large tolerance of diversity in opinion in the Church' (p. 27). In so doing, he carries on the line of action which was characteristic of the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that of strongly affirming the doctrines which the Universal Church had by formal decrees made to be terms of communion, and of, at the same time, leaving open certain divergencies of opinion in matters about which, from whatever causes, no formal decrees of the Universal Church had been enacted.

I. The first part of the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury is on the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Archbishop distinguishes two opposing opinions on this subject. The first is the Zwinglian view that

'no special gift is bestowed in the Sacrament, but that the value of it, mainly, if not entirely, resides in the effect produced on the soul of the receiver by the commemoration of that wonderful act of love—our Lord's sacrifice of Himself on the Cross' (p. 6).

The second is that of

'those who believe that this Sacrament conveys to the receivers a special mysterious gift, uniting us to Christ in a special manner and degree, giving new power, new cleansing, new life, and even new insight into spiritual things, leavening the whole being with a heavenly infection' (pp. 6-7).¹

Since the Archbishop lays down that 'between these two opinions there can be no question at all that the Church holds the latter' (p. 7), it is unnecessary for us to refer further to the former except to mention an interesting letter in the *Times* of December 17 in which the Duke of Argyll contended that the official teaching of 'the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland and England' would by no means be fairly characterized by the Archbishop's description of the repudiated opinion, and our own conviction that the belief of Protestants about the Eucharist has often in reality been fuller than they themselves would have been willing to allow.

Affirming, then, that the Church of England is committed to the belief that the 'Sacrament conveys to the receivers a special mysterious gift,' the Archbishop goes on to discuss 'another division of opinion' (p. 8). He states one of two opposing views as asserting

'that in some mysterious way there is a presence attached to the elements from the moment of their consecration' (p. 10);

¹ With all respect, we wish the Archbishop had chosen some other phrase than 'a heavenly infection' to express his meaning.

and on the second of them says :

'On the theory that the Real Presence is bestowed in the reception, and not before, then the effect of the prayer of consecration is to attach to the elements, not a presence, but a promise. The bread has been blessed according to our Lord's command, and the Lord's promise is that when the communicant partakes of this bread, so blessed, he shall be a partaker of the Lord's body' (p. 9).

These two opposing views, the Archbishop declares, are both lawful in the Church of England. The second of them, he says, 'entirely satisfies all the language of the Articles and the Prayer Book' (p. 9) ; 'it is not unlawful to hold' the first of them 'and to teach it within the Church of England' (p. 10) ; 'up to this point the Church of England leaves the question open' (*ibid.*).

Now, we certainly think that the Church of England has meant to leave very much open as to the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. But we would respectfully submit that, not to mention for the present other evidence from the Prayer Book, the language of the Catechism and the expression in the Articles that the 'Body of Christ' is 'given' and 'taken' as well as 'received and eaten' indicate that the formularies are not fully satisfied by any merely receptionist view. Consequently, we are able to welcome very heartily a paragraph in the Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of York in which it is said :

'It can hardly be doubted that in the Blessed Sacrament there is a real presence of our Blessed Lord ; a presence unique in its character and spiritual in its conditions. It is clearly contrary to the teaching of the Church to say that such a presence is generated only in the heart of the faithful recipient of the Holy Communion. The language both of the Catechism and the Communion Service distinctly implies that our Blessed Lord is present in the Holy Sacrament in what is commonly called an objective though spiritual sense, and that His entrance into the soul is, if I may so speak, *ab extra*. "The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed *taken* and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Further, it appears that the means by which we receive the same is the participation of the consecrated elements of bread and wine, designated for this special purpose ; and that the effect of that blessed presence when received in the faithful soul, is nothing less than is stated in the words of our Lord Himself, and repeated in our own Communion Office, "then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us" (pp. 22-3).

It is simply the natural deduction from the statements 'our Blessed Lord is present in the Holy Sacrament in what is commonly called an objective though spiritual sense,' 'His entrance into the soul is, if I may so speak, *ab extra*,' that the

sacred Presence is to be associated with the consecration, and not merely with the reception.¹

The Archbishop of Canterbury emphasizes the condemnation of the theory of Transubstantiation by the Church of England. He expresses strongly also his own rejection of this theory and classes it among 'human inventions' which 'have been allowed to supersede the teaching of Scripture' (p. 11). In like manner the Archbishop of York, while pointing out that 'no particular belief' on the subject of the 'mode' of the Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament 'can be demanded from the members of the Church of England,' adds

'One, indeed, of the theories (that of Transubstantiation) as to the manner of the union of our Blessed Lord with the material elements which He has appointed for His holy purpose has been explicitly and emphatically condemned by the Church of England and was unknown to the whole Church of Christ through many centuries after the Apostolic times' (p. 24).

It may be contended with some force that the condemnation of 'Transubstantiation' in the twenty-eighth Article is to be confined to the popular as distinct from the technical form of the doctrine; and in the declarations of high authorities laying down the position of the Church of England we are distinctly of opinion that allowance ought to have been made for this. Yet in so saying we wish to state our own belief that the objections to even the technical form of Transubstantiation are of a very grave character. The assertion of it may perhaps be pardoned to the Schoolmen in their laudable though mistaken desire to state Christian doctrine in such a way that, on account of its harmony with the Aristotelian philosophy, it might wear its strongest aspect against the attacks of unbelief. As affirmed at Trent as part of the faith, it does great injury to religion by associating Christian doctrine with a particular system of philosophy and by unnecessarily narrowing the limits of belief. We understand

¹ We regret that elsewhere the Archbishop of York, in condemning the 'ringing of a bell at the moment of the consecration,' should say that this practice is 'suggestive of teaching which has no sanction from the Church as regards the immediate effect produced by the prayer of consecration' (p. 26). This statement lends itself to the support of a denial of the objectivity of the Presence such as the Archbishop would evidently repudiate, and does not appear consistent with the rubric which directs that, when a second consecration is necessary, simply the part of the prayer of consecration referring to the element which has to be consecrated is to be used. Misuse has already been made of it by Sir William Harcourt in his letter in the *Times* of December 29.

that even among Roman Catholics there are not a few of the more intelligent who would be rid if they could both of the word Transubstantiation and of the precision of the definition of the doctrine.

The Archbishop of Canterbury describes the doctrine of the Real Presence of our Lord in the consecrated elements, which he states to be allowed, though not expressly taught, by the Church of England, as 'the Lutheran doctrine commonly called Consubstantiation' (pp. 10, 12). It is obvious that the identification of this doctrine with Lutheran teaching may have been intended by the Archbishop to reconcile to the allowance of it some of those who, while strongly opposed to the assertion of the Real Presence in the elements, hold the work of Luther in high regard. Allowing for this intention we think the identification a matter for sincere regret. It is so because of the doubts as to the meaning of Luther's teaching on the subject and the complication introduced by his notion of the ubiquity of the Manhood of our Lord; because of the unfortunate associations of the word 'Consubstantiation' which has commonly, though perhaps wrongly, been taken to mean a material intermingling of the Body and Blood of Christ with the bread and wine parallel to the intermingling of our Lord's Deity and Humanity asserted by some forms of Monophysitism; and also because of the abandonment of any practical holding of the Real Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the consecrated elements by almost all Lutherans at the present time.

II. The second part of the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury is on 'the proper objects of worship and prayers for the dead.' In pointing out the dangerous character of the complex distinctions in degrees of worship which had become common at the time of the Reformation the Archbishop explains the 'true purpose of religious observances' as being 'to sanctify the life by bringing it nearer to God' so that 'if the life be not really holier, religious observances are of little value' (p. 14). He includes 'invocation to any saints,' and 'any other external mark of adoration' to 'Christ present in the Sacrament' 'except that of kneeling to receive the consecrated Elements' among the practices prohibited by the English Church (p. 15). On the subject of prayers for the dead there is much that is of great value in the recognition of the lawfulness and utility of 'prayers for those whom we love and who are gone before us,' in the caution with which the state of the departed is spoken of, and in the statement that the introduction of prayers for the dead

into public worship is authorized only 'in the most cautious and guarded manner' (pp. 17-18). On invocation of saints we have written elsewhere in the present number, and we need not say more on this subject here than that in condemning the 'Romish doctrine concerning' 'invocation of saints' the Church of England has no more condemned the private use of all forms of invocation than by condemning the 'Romish doctrine concerning purgatory' she has condemned every form of prayers for the dead. To the subject of the methods of adoration we must refer later on in the present article.

On these matters the Archbishop of York, while expressing no opinion as to what is lawful in private prayers, says expressly as to public worship:

'No invocations of the Holy Angels or of the Blessed Virgin or of departed Saints, and no definite prayers for the dead, can be allowed to find a place in any service to be used within the walls of a consecrated church' (p. 30).

We do not know whether the phrase 'no definite prayers for the dead' as describing what cannot be allowed in public worship is intended to be equivalent to the statement of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that public prayers for the dead must be expressed 'in the most cautious and guarded manner.' If so, the word 'definite' seems to us a little misleading, for surely there is no want of definiteness in the prayer that 'all,' the 'whole Church' of God—that is, the departed as well as the living—'may obtain remission of' 'sins and all other benefits of' Christ's 'passion.' This prayer of the Church of England is certainly expressed 'in the most cautious and guarded manner'; it can hardly be said to be other than 'definite' in the ordinary sense of the word. Indeed, we wish that some who clamour for services which are not provided by the Book of Common Prayer would themselves remember, and would be careful to teach others, that the Church of England, in the very prayer in which she presents to God the Father the oblation of the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' of the Body and Blood of Christ, pleads for that part of the Church which has passed through death, as well as for that which is now living upon earth, that it 'may obtain remission of' 'sins and all other benefits of' the 'passion' of our Lord and Saviour.

III. The third part of the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury is on the 'practice of Confession,' and there is a long paragraph on the same subject in the Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of York. It will be a great comfort to many

to f
Sou
com
pud
bur

ledg
only
ness
any
abs
hum

sion
clear
cont
men
inter
every

of E
add
direc
Arch
tians
spea
They
Cant
'the
term
altog
ing t
of En
(p. 22)
puls
teach
tione
heari
to the

1 S
2 I
as to v
the bis
vided

to find that such a position as that taken up by the Bishop of Southwell, upon which it was our duty in our last number to comment with some severity,¹ is clearly and entirely repudiated by both Archbishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury says:

'If anyone wishes to confess, the permission to do so is acknowledged in the Prayer Book; and, if the need of it be strongly felt, not only acknowledged, but encouraged. . . . A man in serious sickness . . . is to be exhorted, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, to make special confession of his sins, and absolution is ordered to be pronounced if he shall heartily and humbly desire it' (p. 22).

According to the Archbishop of York:

'It is impossible for anyone honestly to deny that private confession to an individual minister of Christ is, within certain limits, clearly sanctioned by the Church of England. . . . Nor can it be contended that the confession allowed by the Church, and commended under certain conditions, is of the same kind as that private intercourse between the Pastor and his people which is recognized in every religious community in the world' (pp. 30-1).

To these assertions of the provision made by the Church of England for the practice of Confession both Archbishops add expressions of its value. 'Confession,' 'handled' as directed by the Church of England, 'has often,' says the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'been of invaluable help to Christians in their spiritual life' (p. 23). The Archbishop of York speaks of 'the legitimate use of this spiritual help' (p. 31). They give also warnings as to its use. The Archbishop of Canterbury says, 'Under a system of' enforced confession 'the penitent will get forgiveness from the priest on far easier terms than from his own conscience,' and 'few people can altogether avoid confessing other people's sins when confessing their own' (pp. 20-1); under the system of the Church of England 'no compulsion, direct or indirect, is ever allowed' (p. 22). The Archbishop of York lays down that 'the compulsory use of confession' 'is distinctly contrary to the teaching of the Church of England, and cannot be sanctioned' (p. 31); and he adds a caution as to the habitual hearing of confessions by 'young men very recently admitted to the priesthood'² (p. 32).

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1898, pp. 3-12.

² It is only fair to point out that the present utter lack of discipline as to what priests hear confessions is largely due to the past action of the bishops in either discouraging or ignoring the use of Confession provided for in the Prayer Book. Much that is unsatisfactory in the atti-

Amid so much that is helpful it is uncongenial to criticize, yet we must express our regret that the subject of Confession has not been treated from a somewhat less subjective point of view, and that reference has not been made to the solemn words of our Blessed Lord when He gave to the Apostles the powers of remitting and retaining sins, and to the repetition of those words by the ordaining bishop to every priest who is ordained in the Church of England. And even from the subjective point of view we regret the apparent sanction by the Archbishop of Canterbury of the confession of one sin without any mention of others (p. 23). There are of course cases in which the pressure of one sin is felt to be so great a burden, and the one sin itself is recognized as so grievous an offence against Almighty God, that the thought of it for the time being blots out the realization of any other sins. We believe that the judgment of priests who have great experience in hearing confessions and have practically learnt its risks and its benefits, will bear us out in saying that as a rule it is unlikely that penitence is real and a confession subjectively good if the penitent, while confessing some sins, withholds others.

IV. Fourthly, the Archbishop of Canterbury deals with 'uniformity in ceremonial.' He strongly affirms the need of such uniformity.

'The ceremonial of the Church is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and no departure from what is therein prescribed is allowed, except by the intervention of lawful authority in each particular case. . . . No words and no ceremony can be added to or omitted from the words and ceremonies prescribed by and in the book. The book itself leaves a good deal of discretion to the clergyman; but that discretion is confined to that which is expressly given. There are alternative prayers; in some cases there are prayers which may be used or omitted. There are other instances of the same kind; but, except where discretion is mentioned, the book must be followed exactly as it stands, unless superior authority shall intervene, and it is to be remembered that the promise to do this is ordered, not by Act of Parliament, but by Canon—not by the State, but by the Church' (pp. 25-6).

After this clear statement—to which we wish there had been added some reference to the inferences involved in the

tude of some clergy towards Confession may be ascribed to the same cause. We may notice here that it is characteristic of Sir William Harcourt's methods of controversy that he has taken a foolish letter in the *Church Review* of December 29, 1898, as if it were representative of the minds of those clergy who habitually hear confessions; see *Times*, January 5, 1899, p. 8.

pass
Serv
Bish
in th

'unl
in th
in pr
cerer
tiona
point
it, or
(pp.

And
the s

'
if he
to use
to rec
elevat
be ter
(p. 15

S
more

'N
vices
or sa
nature
infract
the al
sancti
careful
the di
which
Church

'T
things,
was ce
introd
origina
period
holds i
The of
been c
leaving
might
tainly t
... E

passage in the preface to the Prayer Book 'Concerning the Service of the Church' which provides that the decision by the Bishop of any dispute 'be not contrary to anything contained in this Book'—the Archbishop proceeds to characterize as

'unlawful by the Church's law to elevate the consecrated Elements in the Communion Office, to use incense ceremonially by carrying it in procession or by censuring persons or things, to mix water with wine ceremonially by doing it visibly during the office, to introduce additional prayers, to introduce psalms, or hymns, or anthems at any point in the services, except where there is special order permitting it, or where the service is, for any reason, legitimately interrupted' (pp. 27-28).

And to quote a passage which we passed by in considering the second part of the Charge, the Archbishop there says:

'It is allowed to a man to adore Christ present in the Sacrament if he believes Him to be there present, but it is not allowed to anyone to use any other external mark of adoration except that of kneeling to receive the consecrated Elements. The priest is not allowed to elevate the Elements before the people, lest perchance they should be tempted to worship those Elements, and not only Christ Himself' (p. 15).

Some of the points raised in these two passages are treated more fully by the Archbishop of York:

'No individual clergyman has a right to introduce into the services of his parish church any ceremony that is not clearly authorized or sanctioned by the Prayer Book. Anything, therefore, of the nature of an interpolation in any of the appointed services is an infraction of the rule of the Church. The one exception which the almost universal practice prevailing in the Church has indirectly sanctioned is that of hymns. But even the use of these must be carefully restrained so as not to interfere with the proper sequence of the different parts of divine service, nor to suggest any doctrine which is not in entire consonance with the authorized teaching of the Church' (p. 14).

'The ceremonial use of incense, as in the censuring of persons or things, cannot be sanctioned. . . . The use of incense in any form was certainly unknown in the primitive Church. It probably was not introduced till the fifth or sixth century. In all possibility it was originally used merely to sweeten the air. . . . It was only at a later period that it seems to have gradually taken the place which it now holds in the services of the Roman and of the Eastern Church. . . . The offering of incense under the Jewish dispensation seems to have been confined to casting or sprinkling it on fire, in a censer, and leaving it to burn within the Holy Place. . . . Such a use of incense might possibly be tolerated in the Church of England; and certainly there could be nothing in it which could justly give offence. . . . Even thus it could only be sanctioned by special permission

under the general rule as to interpretation of the rubric concerning the ornaments of the Church. . . . The sprinkling of water upon any congregation, or upon individuals, however beautiful in its symbolism, and even when associated with a service in other respects entirely Scriptural, would evidently fall under the same condemnation and could not possibly obtain the sanction of any duly constituted authority' (pp. 15-17).

The Archbishop of York does not expressly refer to the elevation and external marks of adoration of the consecrated Elements and the ceremonial mixing of water with the wine, condemned as unlawful by the Archbishop of Canterbury. We hope the absence of such reference means that on these points he is not in agreement with his brother Archbishop. Considering the nature of the rubrics of the English Prayer Book, we do not think it can be fairly said that with regard to these matters 'omission is prohibition.' The 'Ornaments Rubric' appears to contemplate the water cruet as well as the wine cruet being 'in use' in such a way as it was used in rites in which the chalice was ceremonially mixed. The statement of the twenty-eighth Article that 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance' 'lifted up,' considering the nature and purpose and history of the Articles, can hardly mean more than that elevation is not of the essence of the Sacrament.

On the subject of hymns, the statements of the two Archbishops are in agreement with one another, and it would be a matter for great thankfulness if the limitations which they put upon the use of these additions to the Book of Common Prayer were more generally observed. It is seriously embarrassing to devout worshippers to find the service interrupted by hymns which by their poverty of thought or the questionable orthodoxy of their doctrine increase the aggravation which is caused by the interruption itself. And we hope we may infer from what both Archbishops say that they will use their influence with the bishops of their respective provinces to induce them to discontinue the interruptions caused in the Order of Confirmation in more dioceses than one by the introduction of hymns where they 'interfere with the proper sequence of the different parts of divine service.'

The Archbishops agree in condemning the ceremonial use of incense. The Archbishop of Canterbury is silent as to the non-ceremonial use. The Archbishop of York says it can only be allowed 'by special permission.' We are obliged to say we do not understand this last statement. The practice

in qu
Praye
any
'perm
ventu
cerem
incen
includ
of us
time
and n

O
made
any f
Churc
centu
to the
secon
moni
that
last c
Cano
sentat
Arch
incen
toral
have

T
reser
York

'T
ment,
reserv
carryi

The
histor
Engl
Brea

1
σθωσα
2
oratio
Anast
3
ἰξὼν ἑ
θυμια

in question is either in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer or it is not. If it is so in accordance, it does not need any 'special permission'; if it is not, we do not see how the 'permission' can be given. On a more important matter, we venture to doubt the opinion of both Archbishops that the ceremonial use of incense is unlawful. The lawfulness of incense at all depends, we presume, on the use of it being included under the 'Ornaments Rubric.' If so, the method of use must be that which was known and practised at the time to which the rubric refers; and this was the ceremonial and not the non-ceremonial use.

On an historical point, we are perplexed by a statement made by the Archbishop of York. 'The use of incense in any form,' he says, 'was certainly unknown in the primitive Church. It probably was not introduced till the fifth or sixth century.' Even if the reference in the *Apostolical Constitutions* to the censer and the incense,¹ which probably dates from the second half of the fourth century, simply alludes to the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law, the *Pilgrimage of St. Silvia* shows that incense was in use at Jerusalem in the early part of the last quarter of the fourth century,² and the third *Apostolical Canon*, dating from about the same time, mentions the presentation of incense on the altar at the offertory.³ Since the Archbishop doubtless examined the evidence for the use of incense before he wrote the statement contained in his Pastoral Letter, it appears that by some slip of the pen he must have expressed his meaning wrongly.

The Archbishop of Canterbury refers briefly to the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. The Archbishop of York treats of it at some length. The former says:

'There are some things which are forbidden by positive enactment, and must not be done either ceremonially or not, such as the reservation of the consecrated Elements after the office is over, or carrying them out of the church for any purpose whatever' (p. 28).

The Archbishop of York, after some consideration of the history of the practice of reservation and of the rubric of the English Church which orders that 'if any remain of' 'the Bread and Wine' 'which was consecrated, it shall not be

¹ *Const. Apost.* ii. 26: αἱ τε παρθένοι εἰς τύπον τοῦ θυμιατηρίου τετυμῆσθωσαν καὶ τοῦ θυμιάματος.

² *S. Silvia Peregrinatio*: 'Dictis ergo his tribus psalmis et factis orationibus tribus, ecce etiam thimiataria inferuntur intro spelunca Anastasis, ut tota basilica Anastasis repleatur odoribus.'

³ *Can. Apost.* 3: τῷ καιρῷ τῷ δέοντι πλὴν νέων χιδρων ἢ σταφυλῆς μὴ ἐξὸν ἔστω προσάγεσθαι τι πρὸς θυμιαστήριον καὶ ἔλαιον εἰς τὴν λυχρίαν καὶ θυμίαμα τῷ καιρῷ τῆς θείας ἀναφορᾶς.

carried out of the church' but is to be 'reverently' consumed, expresses his opinion that this rubric was intended to forbid reservation as well as to prevent profanation, and on the practical question writes :

'There are, of course, very special cases of emergency where permission might possibly be given to carry the Holy Communion directly, if necessary, from the service in church to the sick bed of a dying person or some other sufferer, but without any reservation whatever in any part of the church. But as a better alternative, the Communion Service in the sick chamber might be greatly shortened, so long as its essential features were used. In every such instance, however, it would be necessary in this diocese for the parish priest to obtain first my special sanction ; or if this should not be possible, then to acquaint me, as soon as may be, with what he has done, as is provided by the rubric in similar exceptional cases' (p. 20).

In the same part of his Charge the Archbishop of Canterbury discusses the use of 'additional services.' He adheres to the interpretation of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872 which has come to be associated with his name, according to which the restriction that 'additional services' must not contain 'anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer' simply means that such services must be substantially in harmony with the Bible and the Prayer Book (pp. 30-33). We must again express our respectful dissent from this interpretation. We have not, indeed, the slightest confidence that the phraseology of the ill-considered Act which has introduced confusion and abetted lawlessness and done much to destroy the sense of liturgical propriety in the Church of England expresses the meaning which those who drew it up intended it to convey ; but it is a legal document, and, if it is used at all, its language must be taken as it stands. The phrase 'part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer' cannot be regarded as the legal expression for services differing in words but 'identical in substance with parts of the Bible and parts of the Prayer Book'; and, if they could, the whole sentence would in that case sanction the use of hymns and anthems which are not in accordance with the doctrine taught in the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, a result which, though we know it is put in action by the selection of hymns in some churches, can hardly have been intended by the promoters of the Act. And we must further express our regret that the Archbishop, instead of using words which, however unfairly, will certainly be seized upon as justification for all manner of fancy services, has not pointed out that it is the

true wisdom of the clergy to teach their people to bring their own personal needs into connexion with the appointed Order for Morning and Evening Prayer and Holy Communion.

On a connected subject we may notice that the Archbishop of York, specially mentioning 'Corpus Christi' and 'All Souls,' declares that

'there is no authority whatever for the observance of any other festivals than those which are contained in the Calendar of the Book of Common Prayer' (p. 12).

V. The fifth part of the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury is on 'the power of the bishops.' A distinction is drawn between the 'two kinds of power' which the bishop possesses, 'one coercive, the other not' (p. 35). The Archbishop first describes the 'non-coercive jurisdiction.'

'This jurisdiction is a Church jurisdiction, pure and simple. It rests entirely on Church law, and it is enforced by spiritual means only. For the purposes of this jurisdiction the Church has enacted the canons and the rubrics of the Prayer Book, and the canons have imposed upon the clergy the obligation to promise the observance of the rubrics; have further imposed upon them, if employed in the Church, the oath of canonical obedience to the bishop; and, finally, the Church has given to the bishop the office of interpreting the rubrics in all cases of dispute. If a clergyman has a doubt about the meaning of a rubric, or if some parishioners dispute his interpretation, the party or parties are told to go to the bishop for direction.

'The bishop is to say what the rubric means, and if his interpretation is doubted the appeal is to the Archbishop. The bishop having interpreted the rubric can then enjoin the observance of it, and the oath of canonical obedience requires the clergyman to obey the bishop's injunction. The bishop cannot in any way use coercion. The sanction is the clergyman's double promise. If the clergyman determines to break this promise, the bishop can use no compulsion. The appeal is to the man's conscience and to the sacredness of a promise without which he could not have entered the ministry at all' (p. 36).

After speaking of the 'coercive jurisdiction' which 'is exercised through the courts' (p. 36), and describing 'proceedings in the courts' as 'very ill-suited to bring about a healthy obedience to the law in a Church' (p. 37), the Archbishop makes an impressive appeal to the clergy:

'It seems to me that there is but one way in which Christian ministers can rightly follow their Master's lead, and that is by letting themselves be led by those who, under God and by God's appointment, are their natural leaders—namely, the bishops of their dioceses' (p. 37).

In passing, the Archbishop refers to the episcopal veto on

legal proceedings as 'a power which on proper occasions certainly someone ought to possess, but which does not make the enforcement of the law at all easier' (p. 37).

Our gratitude to the Archbishop for the appeal which he makes to the best feelings of the clergy, for his approval (for so we understand it) of the retention of the episcopal veto, and for the subsequent words in which he hopefully anticipates that 'the restoration of the Church's unity' may 'eventually' 'come' 'out of the evangelization of the world' (p. 38), makes us the more regret that he should refer to the 'Supreme Court of appeal in matters ecclesiastical' (p. 12; cf. pp. 10, 32), as if he held that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was possessed of authority in Church affairs.

VI. The Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of York deals with a matter of the highest importance which is not mentioned in the Charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Referring to the rubric which enacts

'All priests and deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause,'

the Archbishop expresses his hope

'that there are few clergy in the Church of England who do not conscientiously fulfil, at least in private, this duty so clearly binding upon them' (p. 7).

He then goes on to speak of the further direction:

'The curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word and to pray with him.'

In view of the 'amount of discretion' 'left to the clergy to determine what is or is not a "reasonable hindrance,"' the Archbishop says:

'It is to be remembered that the saying "openly" of the Daily Service does not, as a matter of time, exceed by more than a few minutes that which must be occupied in saying it privately, which is obligatory on all except under very special circumstances. And further, it is to be borne in mind that the requirement of the Prayer Book in this matter is intended to provide not only for the spiritual life of the clergyman himself, or of his flock, but also to give an opportunity for that daily offering of prayer and praise on the part of the people collectively, which both in the Jewish temple and in all ages of the Christian Church has been enjoined upon them as justly due to the God and Father of us all' (p. 8).

'
clergy
entitled
unless
the s
of a
investi
life.
close
cases
the C
seek
need
'

Prayer
enough
in the
ordin
for as
expect

V
tricit
of th
in sta
Chur
flagra
Book
Prayer
of Y
that
by e
Engl
T

is ad
the l
Arch
'the
Days
and c

'I
1 V
having
'to be
vices
this p
Prayer
its ent

'The saying of the daily services is both an obligation on the clergyman and a duty which he owes to his parishioners. They are entitled to expect this provision to be made for their spiritual need, unless there be some reasonable cause to the contrary. Wherever the service is withheld the parishioners suffer loss; they are deprived of a means of grace which many of them rightly feel to be of inestimable value in elevating and strengthening their devotional life. To many of them it is a real sorrow to find their churches closed throughout the greater part of the week, and in not a few cases it has had the result of leading some to determine that if the Church of their fathers will do no more for them, they must seek elsewhere for the blessings and helps which they consciously need' (p. 9).

'Even when the necessary half-hour is spent in the House of Prayer instead of in the parsonage house, there will still be time enough left for teaching the children in school; for visiting the sick in their homes; for the study to which we pledged ourselves at our ordination; for the needful rest and recreation of a busy life; and for as large an amount of other pastoral duties as can be reasonably expected from us day by day' (pp. 10-11).

We are not blind, as we have often shown, to the eccentricities and lawless acts of some clergy who, in the phrase of the day, are called ritualistic; but we have no hesitation in stating our conviction that the greatest existing evil in the Church of England in the matter of services is that of the flagrant disobedience to the plain directions of the Prayer Book by the omission of the Order of Morning and Evening Prayer. We rejoice at the weighty words of the Archbishop of York, of which we have quoted a small part. We wish that all he says on this subject may be read and pondered by every clergyman and every candidate for ordination in England.¹

To what is said about daily service an admirable passage is added by the Archbishop of York on the observance of the Holy Days and Seasons of the Christian Year. The Archbishop calls attention to the order that

'the curate shall declare unto the people what Holy Days or Fasting Days are in the week following to be observed,'

and comments upon it:

'It follows as a matter of course that he is to make provision

¹ We notice with very great regret that the Bishop of Chichester, having been consulted by a clergyman in his diocese, has advised him 'to begin with a daily morning service according to the Shortened Services Act of 1872.' See *Guardian*, January 4, 1899, pp. 3-4. Even if, in this particular case, it is temporarily impossible to say the Evening Prayer as well as the Morning Prayer, the latter might surely be said in its entirety.

for their observance. I have reason to fear that this duty is not always observed. But it is not a mere matter of obedience to a rubric; it has a most important bearing upon the religious life of both pastor and people.

'These Fasts and Festivals of the Church, which in many parishes are neglected almost altogether, or are lightly esteemed and even looked on with suspicion, are of inestimable value in developing and strengthening the spiritual life' (p. 11).

'Where they are neglected or observed in a mere perfunctory way, a very serious loss must accrue to both pastor and people' (p. 12).

VII. We have criticized with freedom the Charge and the Letter which have been addressed to the dioceses of Canterbury and York by the Archbishops, believing that the interests of truth are served by such criticism, and that the utterance of it is compatible with the fullest respect for the personal character and high office of the two prelates. Possibly some of our readers will think we have criticized too little. We are aware that a feeling of distress has been caused, especially among the laity, by some parts of these documents, a distress likely to be aggravated by the misleading letter on the subject of the Archbishop of York's Pastoral which Sir William Harcourt has addressed to the editor of the *Times*.¹ There are those who, to put it plainly, are saying, If all this is true, the Church of England is a compromise; and, if it is a compromise, it cannot be part of the Catholic Church of Christ. To any who are so inclined to think we would suggest two considerations. In the first place, the word 'compromise' is not, strictly speaking, the right word to apply to such toleration of divergencies as the Church of England has allowed. Let us illustrate what we mean by the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Church of England, as we have already pointed out, affirmed with the greatest clearness the doctrines which the Universal Church had by formal decrees made terms of communion. The historical Creeds were retained. The statements of the Articles about the Trinity and the Incarnation are of the most explicit kind. But on doctrines about which no formal decrees of the Universal Church existed, of which the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist was one, it was felt that a different course must be adopted. In times of chaos and confusion, such as prevailed throughout the whole period of the English Reformation, it is sometimes necessary to be content with absolutely securing a few points, and to leave others to be

¹ See *Times*, December 29, 1898, p. 8.

secu
fait
sacra
some
crati
elem
the C
Artic
to as
Holy
secre
cant.
the
recep
Engl
if, w
Chur
takal
about
Chur
A
the p
occas
of E
gratu
time
when
and I
at be
pract
woul
The
ful st
find
face,
what
Move
sacra
eviden
that
who
the d
while
time
emph

secured in the course of time. The central doctrines of the faith, the historical ministry, and the administration of the sacraments were absolutely secured. On other matters a somewhat different line was taken. The Prayer of Consecration, the first part of the words of administration, other elements in the Order of Holy Communion, the language of the Catechism, and the history and exact phraseology of the Articles, show that the mind of the Church of England was to assert the doctrine that the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist is to be associated with the action of consecration and not merely with the reception by the communicant. But the caution and reserve used in the language of the formularies left it possible for persons who held the receptionist theory to remain and to minister within the English Church. It is not, properly speaking, a 'compromise' if, while truths the acceptance of which the Universal Church has made a condition of communion are unmistakably asserted as part of what all must hold, other truths about which there are no actual decrees of the Universal Church are less stringently imposed.

And, in the second place, the present is not the time and the publication of this Charge and Pastoral Letter is not the occasion for distress amounting to despair about the Church of England. Rather, they call for thankfulness and congratulation. We have not to look back very far to see a time when the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration were few; when the Zwinglian view of the Holy Eucharist was common and hardly any of the clergy held more than the virtualist or at best the receptionist theory of that Sacrament; when the practice of Confession had become almost unknown and would have been condemned by the whole episcopal bench. The life of Dr. Pusey was largely taken up with the successful struggle to alter this state of things. And what do we now find taught on these subjects by the two Archbishops, in the face, let us remember, of a determined effort to overthrow what Dr. Pusey and others who took part in the Oxford Movement accomplished? 'The teaching of baptism as the sacrament of regeneration,' says the Archbishop of York with evident approval, 'has now become so general in the Church that it is only very rarely that one meets with a clergyman who adheres to the standpoint of Mr. Gorham' (p. 33). On the doctrine of the Eucharist, the Archbishop of Canterbury, while holding that the Church of England leaves open the time at which the Presence of our Lord is vouchsafed, says emphatically 'there can be no question at all that the

Church' (*i.e.* the Church of England) 'holds' that 'the bread and the wine' 'are figures which imply realities' and that 'this Sacrament conveys to the receivers' 'the Body and Blood of Christ' (pp. 6-7); and the Archbishop of York is more explicit in connecting the Presence of our Lord with the elements 'in' 'an objective' 'sense,' so that 'His entrance into the soul is' '*ab extra*' (p. 23). On the practice of Confession, both Archbishops describe it as recognized by the Church of England and provided for by the Book of Common Prayer. We do not mean, as we have plainly shown, that everything either in the Charge or in the Pastoral Letter is wholly as we could wish; we do say emphatically that both Charge and Letter mark a marvellous advance in the recovery of those parts of the beliefs and practice of the Universal Church which during times of laxity had become obscured in England.

The Archbishop of York concludes his Letter with an appeal, with the substance of which we find ourselves in great sympathy and agreement, to the spirit of self-sacrifice which may be shown in the obedience of the clergy to constituted authority. And it is encouraging to know that prominent men of different parties in the Church of England have shown some willingness to act in such a spirit. The clergy of St. Alban's, Holborn, have referred to the action of the Bishop of London in attempting to bring the services of that church somewhat more into conformity with the Book of Common Prayer as a command 'entirely within his rights to make,' and 'entirely within 'their' duty loyally to obey.'¹ Canon Fleming, in consequence of a direction from the same Bishop, has discontinued his practice of omitting the Lord's Prayer, the Collect for Purity, the Commandments, the Prayer for the Queen, the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, and the Creed at early celebrations of the Holy Communion, though we regret to see that he has at the same time suggested to his congregation that they should not attend the part of the service preceding the offertory.² Yet we cannot but feel that, for many earnest men, the weight of such appeals as those made by both Archbishops will, however wrongly, be greatly diminished if a minority of the bishops continue to act and

¹ See *Times*, December 19, 1898, p. 10.

² See *Times*, December 27, 1898, p. 5, January 2, 1899, p. 7. We are glad to see that the Principal of Pusey House has pointed out that a 'very momentous provision of the Church of England is quietly neutralized' unless the 'communicant is called upon to join in the Nicene Creed, and his belief is thus made a condition of his Communion': see *Times*, January 5, 1899, p. 8.

speal
Bish
at th
Book
pract
Engl
ness
his d
book
any
auth
small
Praye
we re
peace
alread
Pasto
T
Churc
in aut
sidera
needs
to unc
spiritu
have r
and co
to wh
least
grapp

The R
fo
by
'P
m

We ha
of Indi
think i
Englan
treated

speak in the future as they have done in the past. The Bishop of Liverpool's recent sneer—for it is nothing else—at the utility of the daily services ordered by the Prayer Book,¹ and the Bishop of Southwell's contention that the practice of Confession is not contemplated by the Church of England,² and the Bishop of Worcester's apparent unwillingness to stop the ministrations of a beneficed clergyman in his diocese who openly teaches heresy and has published a book which denies the deity of our Lord, weaken seriously any attempt made to promote greater conformity to our authorized formularies. If the Archbishops can induce a small number of the bishops to be more loyal to the Prayer Book of the Church whose servants they are, they will, we respectfully submit, have done hardly less to promote the peace and welfare of the Church of England than they have already accomplished in the recently issued Charge and Pastoral Letter.

Truly, the time is full of anxiety for loyal sons of the Church of England. It calls for most serious thought from those in authority and those under authority. It demands the consideration of great principles and all which they involve. Its needs will not be met except as those in authority take pains to understand not only their historical position but also the spiritual needs of Church-people, and as those under authority have regard not only to themselves and their own parishes and congregations, but also to the wider interests of the body to which they belong. It is a time also of hope, and not least because the Archbishops have made a serious attempt to grapple with the problems of the day.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Regulations of 1860 regarding the use of Government Churches for Presbyterian Worship, and the Revised Regulations of 1898 by which their use was extended to Wesleyans. Extract from the 'Proceedings of the Government of India in the Home Department (Ecclesiastical) Simla, 17th June, 1898.'

WE have placed this official document, issued by the Government of India, at the head and front of our 'Short Notices' because we think it very necessary and desirable that members of the Church of England should know and understand how the Church is being treated by the civil and military authorities in India.

¹ See *Guardian*, November 23, 1898, p. 1806.

² See *Times*, August 24 and September 6, 1898.

On June 17, 1898, an order was issued from the Home Department that 'a church provided by Government and consecrated for the services of the Church of England may be used for the Services of the Church of Scotland and the Wesleyan Church, and for the services of any other denomination to which the Government of India may from time to time make those rules applicable.' There is certainly an *apparent* safeguard in the proviso that 'it shall be necessary to obtain the consent of the bishop of the diocese in each case;' that 'the bishop, or the Church of England chaplain shall under the bishop's instructions fix the hours at which the church shall be available;' and that 'the Bishop of the diocese may withdraw his assent to use the church whenever he shall think fit.' But all this show of fairness and equity is cancelled by the last paragraph, which says that if in any case dissatisfaction is felt with any order passed under these rules as to the use of a church by a congregation not belonging to the Church of England, the complaint is to be brought before the Lieutenant-General of the Command through the General officer Commanding the district, and the Lieutenant-General shall then, if he considers this necessary, communicate with the Bishop. But if the complaining party, either Presbyterian or Wesleyan, is not satisfied with the arrangement made by the Lieutenant-General and the Bishop, the final decision is to rest, in the case of military churches, with the Commander-in-Chief; and in the case of civil churches, with the Local Government. All this means, that the churches 'consecrated and set apart for ever for the honour and worship of Almighty God, and for the celebration of Divine Service according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England,' are to be handed over and placed at the disposal of persons who need not be members of the Church of England, or even Christians at all. For either of these qualifications could easily be fulfilled by a lieutenant-general of the command, or a commander-in-chief. The order was published after the late Metropolitan had resigned, and we can hardly think he would have let it pass without an earnest protest, had it been set forth during his episcopate. But on this point we grieve to say that we cannot speak as positively as we could wish, sinister rumours having reached our ears. We notice that a calm and temperate remonstrance has been sent by the clergy of the various dioceses in India, in which they point out the two distinct difficulties which arise out of the position created by these proposed new rules. The first is that Government have in all cases sanctioned, and in many cases requested, the consecration of all churches of the Church of England in which they are in any way interested. After the consecration the Government assume the office of trustees and maintain the buildings in repair; and the responsibilities of trusteeship in this case mean also the necessity of protecting the bishop and the clergy in the exercise of their duties and exclusive rights which consecration guarantees. The second difficulty naturally comes out of the first, namely, that by claiming a right to violate the trusts declared and set forth by the act of consecration, even though their co-trustee the Bishop in these particular cases dissents

from t
the h
Churc
TH
workin
dence,
the G
author
TH
arrang
1860.
this qu
are di
church
consen
of con
ment a
arrang
they in
vice of
land, t
than a
it is so
tion, al
The
in 186
they h
chapel
Presby
the Go
Highla
at all, r
exist, b
The
earnest
fully.
or abro
There a
the Eng
have da
Englan
prestige
must fa
politica
upon th
cannot
is believ
Dissent
Church
and cou
VOL.

from them, they are introducing a fatal and disastrous principle into the hitherto harmonious co-operation of the Government and the Church of England in India.

There could no longer be any such harmonious or successful working between two parties unless there is perfect faith and confidence, and it is clear *a breach of faith is proposed to be exercised by the Government of India* between themselves and the ecclesiastical authorities.

The justification for this extraordinary act is built upon an arrangement entered into by the Government and Bishop Cotton in 1860. But if anyone will read the *Life of Bishop Cotton*, in which this question is fully entered into (pp. 146-154), he will see the cases are different. The Presbyterians were only allowed to use the churches as a concession, not as a right, and in all cases the final consent or refusal rested with the bishop. As he says, 'the amount of concession to the Scotch Church is considerable.' The Government accepted this position and framed the official notice of the arrangement in conformity with it. For in the Resolution of 1860 they inserted a Clause :—'The Church shall not be used for the service of any other denomination, not being of the Church of England, than Presbyterians, nor shall any other minister officiate in it than a minister of the Church of Scotland.' Now, on this concession it is sought to establish a right, and to admit any other denomination, although this was strictly forbidden in the original rules of 1860.

The Government of India attempt to meet this by saying that in 1860 the number of Wesleyans was comparatively small, and now they have become very numerous. Why not, then, build them a chapel for their use? This idea was thought of in 1860 for the Presbyterians, but was rejected because it was thought certain that the Government would not consent to multiply churches for a few Highland regiments whose detention at any given station, or in India at all, might be of short duration. But this reason does not now exist, by the admission of the Government itself.

There is a reason different from this, and we wish to ask all earnest members of the Church of England to consider it thoughtfully. It is the desire of the authorities in the State, whether at home or abroad, to hamper and lessen the power of the English Church. There are cases in India where the Government have acted towards the English Church as an establishment in a way they would never have dared to act towards the civil or the military service, and in England the tendency of the State is, as we all know, to lower the prestige and position of the Church. The fact is, and Churchmen must face it, that dissenters are becoming more and more strong politically (we do not say religiously), and they exercise great pressure upon the authorities. Their vote and influence is important, and cannot be disregarded by either party when in power. The Church is believed to be a decaying force, and may consequently be neglected. Dissenters use their power in order to weaken and harass the Church. You see this in Parliament, in school boards, in district and county councils, in boards of guardians, in the meetings of rural

parishes. The one thing is to lower the Church. And now we see it in India.

Our contention is that churches consecrated for the use of the Church of England are subject to the trusts declared by the deed of consecration, trusts of which the proposed rules are a gross violation, as the Government themselves are in the position of co-trustees. It should also be remembered that in many cases members of the Church of England, in full faith that the trusts of the deed of consecration would be faithfully and religiously observed, have given lavishly of their substance towards the fabric, the furniture, the fittings, and the sacred vessels of the church. Courts of equity in England, it is notorious, have constantly enforced strict observance of the trusts and conditions imposed by founders of Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Baptist, and other chapels; but the Church of England in British India is by the proposed rules degraded to a lower level than the various Nonconformist bodies in England.

What Churchmen must do is to be active and energetic in asserting their position and rights. The Roman Catholics can do this, the Jews can do this. The Roman Catholic Church in India is as truly endowed by the State, whether as to chaplains or churches, as the English Church is, yet the Government did not venture to propose that every denomination should use their churches, because they felt the opposition would be too strong.

In this present case if all earnest thinking Churchmen at home and in India would unite in a strong and temperate memorial to the authorities in India, to the Secretary of State for India, to members of Parliament who are Churchmen, to all who can make their voice heard, then possibly the hopeful opinion of the *Indian Churchman* (September 1898) may be realized, 'We have every confidence that the situation has but to be explained to Government to be followed by the recall of the new rules.'

We trust that the new Metropolitan, Dr. Welldon, now on his way to India, will insist on getting the rules rescinded. He will do well to bear in mind a very homely saying, 'It is dogged that does it.' Some Bishops in these days seem to consider it the key to popularity and the acme of tact 'not to be too Churchy.' Dr. Welldon, we are persuaded, is not one of these. He will not forget that to pilot the vessel of the Church through the rocks and quicksands which environ it, a man in the exalted position to which God has called him needs not only grace but grit.

The Parallel Psalter: being the Prayer Book Version of the Psalms and a New Version arranged on opposite pages. With an Introduction and Glossaries. By the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Litt. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, &c. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.)

THE title of this book explains its characteristic feature, and the author's name is a guarantee of scholarship and conscientious labour. Whatever Dr. Driver does is done carefully and well. The faults of his work arise from lack of the poetic and imaginative faculties, or

from taking p

The contains Book V mistakes leading this new from oth based d Version. familiar not to p to produ (Preface

The faults of

'The made upw to be not and at th while tho and chas allow the were unav of correct some case from the fact that, need of p tion of ch not forme my aim i versant w a pedantic permits, a Book Ver latter is a paraphras

It is, to this ac have bee psalm at its nine v be regard Psalter. only are v the use of of the G apparently brief but

from his exclusively academic training, never from any failure in taking pains.

The Introduction to this little book is extremely interesting. It contains, first, a concise history of the text of the present Prayer Book Version of the Psalter, and an account of sundry curious mistakes which have crept into the text in later editions. Then the leading principles which have guided the author himself in making this new version are set forth. The feature which distinguishes it from other revised translations of the Psalter now current is that it is based definitely upon and follows the line of our Prayer Book Version. It is thus intended to be a help to those who are most familiar with that version. 'My desire,' says Dr. Driver, 'has been, not to produce a version to supersede the Prayer Book Psalter, but to produce a version which may be read beside it and explain it' (Preface vi).

The author is appreciative of the many beauties as well as the faults of our familiar version.

'The Prayer Book Version of the Psalms has many merits. Though made upwards of 360 years ago, it is still—save for occasional archaisms, to be noted presently—perfectly intelligible; its style is bold and vigorous, and at the same time singularly flowing and melodious; its phraseology while thoroughly idiomatic, and of genuinely native growth, is dignified and chaste. . . . But the warmest admirers of Coverdale's work must allow that it is disfigured by many inaccuracies—inaccuracies which were unavoidable at the time when it was made, but which are capable of correction now. These inaccuracies are due to various causes. In some cases they arise from the undue influence of the Vulgate; in others from the imperfect philology of the sixteenth century; in others from the fact that, even where the general sense was correctly apprehended, the need of precision in such points as the rendering of tenses, the preservation of characteristic expressions, and the distinction of synonyms, was not formerly so clearly perceived as it is in modern times. It has been my aim in the present volume to provide the reader who is not conversant with Hebrew with a version of the Psalms, which while avoiding a pedantic or slavish literalism, may be as faithful to the original as idiom permits, and at the same time by placing it side by side with the Prayer Book Version to enable him to judge for himself where and how far the latter is at fault, and in what case its renderings are merely legitimate paraphrases or real inaccuracies' (xxiv-xxv).

It is, however, we must confess, a little disappointing on turning to this actual revised version, to notice how very many alterations have been made. Hardly a verse remains as it was. Taking a psalm at random, the 137th, we counted at least thirty alterations in its nine verses. We do not, however, complain of this, if the book be regarded simply as a private help to the understanding of the Psalter. This it cannot fail to be for an intelligent student. Not only are well-known blunders corrected; interpolations marked by the use of smaller type (following in this case the forgotten examples of the Great Bible and the Sealed Book), and the connexion of apparently incoherent verses made clear; but there are also some brief but very excellent footnotes, and two glossaries, one of which

discusses the force of characteristic expressions in the Psalms, e.g. 'godly,' 'kindness,' 'naughtiness'; and the other explains the more remarkable archaisms in the Prayer Book Version. But we gather from the end of the Introduction that this book is meant as a contribution towards a hoped-for authoritative revision of the Prayer Book Psalter itself.

'The Prayer Book Version of the Psalms, though sufficient for the requirements of the sixteenth century, does not meet the requirements of the nineteenth or twentieth century. . . . Is it too much to hope that means may be found to mark the opening years of the twentieth century by a revision of the Prayer Book Psalter, worthy of the scholarship of the age, and carried out on the lines which the Bishop of Durham has so justly indicated?' (xli-xlii).

Such a project seems to us too academic to be practical. Dr. Driver's own version, as we have seen, despite the most excellent intention, alters and recasts the Prayer Book Version to such an extent that we tremble to think of the prospect of any authoritative revision being imposed upon the Church of England. If the Psalter, as it stands, had even in its first sixty years so gained the affection of Church people that it was felt impossible to substitute another version for it; how much more deeply during the intervening centuries has it entwined its roots into the devotional life of clergy and laity, charming and soothing with its music and its mystery, its felicitous phrases and its flowing rhythm, even though the connexion of verse with verse be often missed, or the meaning of isolated verses be almost unintelligible!

Moreover, we do not think that the effort, even if successful, would be worth the violence of the strain involved in making it. For the Psalter, to be understood as Dr. Driver would have us understand it, must be *studied*, not merely recited in a new and better translation. We doubt whether the average Church-goer would be any nearer to grasping the wondrous Catholicity of Psalm lxxxvii. in Dr. Driver's translation, excellent though it is, than he is in our present and confessedly obscure version.

1. His foundation is upon the holy mountains.
2. Jehovah loveth the gates of Zion
more than all the dwellings of Jacob.
3. Glorious things are spoken of thee,
O city of God:
4. 'I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon as
them that know me:
'behold Philistia, and Tyre, with Ethiopia—
'this one was born there.'
5. And of Zion it shall be said, 'Each and everyone
was born in her:
'and he, the most High, shall establish her.'
6. Jehovah will count, when he writeth up the peoples (saying),
'This one was born there.'
7. And the singers like the dancers (shall say),
'All my fountains are in thee' (p. 255).

For our own part, all that we can venture to hope for, or even to

desire
Prayer
such
land
Driver
course
at the
any us
worsh
none
melod
is upo
They
that t
that o

Gesen
P
fr
C
si
d

FROM
Gram
work o
to the
knowl
striking
of the
later e
Rödig
of his
out by
Kautzs
greatly
translat
Meanw
(the tw
was co
cast.
the ne
mitted
work o
improv
It
sixth ec
mar, wh
is indis
English
worthy

desire, is not a *revised*, but merely a slightly *corrected* version of the Prayer Book Psalter. We must confess to a monthly impatience of such mistakes as 'Therefore will I remember thee *concerning* the land of Jordan,' or 'Then stood up Phinees and *prayed*' (is Dr. Driver's 'interposed' much better?). Such mistakes as these, of course, alter, or even stultify the whole sense of a passage, and might at the same time be corrected pretty easily. But we do not see that any useful purpose whatsoever from the point of view of the average worshipper, could be gained by substituting, *e.g.*, for 'and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee,' such an unmelodious mouthful as 'and having Thee I delight not in aught that is upon earth,' nor for 'They that sow in tears shall reap in joy,' 'They that sow in tears shall reap with ringing cries.' But we fear that the beginning of revision, perhaps even of correction, is like that of strife—'it is as when one letteth out water.'

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, as edited and enlarged by E. KAUTZSCH, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. Translated from the twenty-fifth German edition by the late Rev. G. W. COLLINS; the translation revised and adjusted to the twenty-sixth edition by A. E. COWLEY, M.A. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1898.)

FROM the date of its first publication in 1813 Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar* has occupied an almost unique position as the standard work of its kind. The fact that it has maintained this reputation down to the present day, despite the remarkable advances made in the knowledge of the Hebrew language during this century, affords a striking testimony to the excellence both of the original work and of the numerous additions and improvements introduced into the later editions by Gesenius himself and by his successors, Professors Rödiger and Kautzsch. The author in all published fourteen editions of his grammar; after his death seven more editions were brought out by Rödiger (1845-72), while the present editor, Professor Kautzsch, issued the twenty-fifth edition in 1891. It was of this last greatly improved edition that the Clarendon Press decided to publish a translation, and entrusted the difficult task to the Rev. G. W. Collins. Meanwhile Professor Kautzsch had been preparing yet another edition (the twenty-sixth), which appeared in 1896, and in which the work was considerably amplified and improved, and in part entirely recast. Owing to the death of Mr. Collins before the appearance of the new edition, the preparation of the English version was committed to the able hands of Mr. Cowley, who not only revised the work of his predecessor, but also brought it into accord with the improvements introduced in the latest German edition.

It is hardly too much to say that Professor Kautzsch's twenty-sixth edition stands alone as the standard text-book of Hebrew grammar, which, combining as it does both the accidence and the syntax, is indispensable to every Hebrew student. The accurate and scholarly English version which Mr. Cowley has produced is in every way worthy of the original, and will prove a great boon to all English

students. The task of translation, which in a technical work of this character is beset by difficulties at every turn, has been most admirably carried out, and the English reader may feel confident that he has before him an exact reproduction of the German. Moreover, in many cases the translation marks an improvement on the original, since it embodies many additional notes and references, due either to Dr. Driver or to the translator.

The *errata* in a volume of this size are surprisingly few. We may note p. 189, l. 20, 1 for 1; p. 383, footnote³, 1 Sam. 26¹⁰ for 1 Sam. 26¹⁶; p. 590, Ps. 19⁴ for Ps. 19¹⁴; Ps. 19⁸ for Prov. 19⁸; Ps. 26³ . . . 112qq for 112r.

Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A Study on the Credibility of St. Luke. By W. M. RAMSAY, M.A., D.C.L. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898.)

PROFESSOR RAMSAY is known to have a high opinion of the merits of St. Luke as a historian, and hitherto he has expressed that opinion chiefly in relation to St. Luke's narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. The question has naturally arisen, and has even been suggested as a sort of challenge, whether the Professor would apply his theory of St. Luke to the Gospel narrative, and in particular to the opening verses of the second chapter of St. Luke.¹ The present work, an expansion of two articles in the *Expositor*, is the Professor's answer to that inquiry. In maintaining that St. Luke is an extremely accurate historian, in the Gospel as well as in the Acts, Professor Ramsay is at all events contending for a view of the author which is in harmony with the profession and claims of the opening verses of the Gospel (chap. i.), and a writer who sees beneath the surface into the plan and unity of St. Luke's history could not think of separating the writer of the Gospel from the writer of the Acts, and of ascribing accuracy to the second while denying that quality to the first (chap. ii.). Two other preliminary points have to be noticed—the Greek standpoint of St. Luke (chap. iii.), and the fact that the evident assistance which our Lord's Mother gave to the Evangelist in the first two chapters lends a crucial importance to the narrative (chap. iv.)—before Professor Ramsay states 'the question at issue' in St. Luke ii. 1-4 (chap. v.) It is not easy to summarize the lucid account which is given of the argument in this chapter. The purport of St. Luke's description is that

'in accordance with the orders of the Roman Emperor Augustus, there was made an enrolment, or numbering, of the population of Herod's kingdom; and this was made according to households and tribal descent and local tribal connection, so that those Hebrews (pp. 190-1) who were not residing in the proper city of their tribe and family were obliged to go to their city in order to be enrolled there. Further, it seems to be im-

¹ Celsus does not appear to have impugned the accuracy of these verses. This is strange, if almost every other word is a blunder. Professor Ramsay does not allude to the very full discussion of the whole question by McClellan (*New Testament*, pp. 392-99), who also suggests that Quirinius went to Palestine 'on some special mission.'

plied th
proper
as a wh

The po
order a
this er
it be n
to Beth
before
alluded
explai
gone to
served
are the
of this
on a se
means
117).
the civ
nized I
The ev
kingdom
The P
words
'a sing
tense,
larly ta
123-4)
put int
force in
to mor
and in
making
when
Palesti
interpr
Egypt
rolmen
the act
the nev
last (se

¹ B
worth's
sults th
tions w
² S
momer
Christi
indicat
³ S

plied that the wife as well as the head of the house had to go to the proper city (or for some reason felt it a duty to go), so that the household as a whole might be numbered in the tribal and family centre' (p. 101).

The points which arise for discussion here are : Did Augustus ever order any general enrolment of the whole Roman world? Would this enrolment extend to such a kingdom as Palestine? Would it be necessary for a man and his espoused wife to go from Nazareth to Bethlehem for such a purpose? Was any census held in Judæa before A.D. 6-7, when Josephus mentions the great census—also alluded to in Acts v. 37? How is the mention of Quirinius to be explained in the face of the fact that Quirinius is known to have gone to Syria as governor after the death of Herod? It will be observed that the first four questions are closely connected and really are the expansion of one question, What is known of the character of this enrolment? The last question concerning Quirinius stands on a separate basis.¹ These questions Professor Ramsay answers by means of a very searching investigation, beginning in chap. vi. (p. 117). He has no difficulty in showing that 'all the world' means the civilized Græco-Roman world, which included Italy, the organized Roman provinces, and the dependent kingdoms such as Judæa. The evidence of Strabo and Appian leaves no doubt that Herod's kingdom would be regarded as part of the Roman world (p. 123). The Professor holds that it is an incorrect interpretation of St. Luke's words to suppose that he is alluding to a decree which ordered that 'a single census should be held.' The Evangelist 'uses the present tense, and he means that Augustus ordered enrolments to be regularly taken,' and laid down a principle of systematic enrolment (pp. 123-4).² He neither states nor implies that the system was actually put into force universally, but he does imply that it was put into force in Syria, and prevailed at periodic intervals. He himself alludes to more than one such enrolment. For here he speaks of the 'first,' and in Acts v. 37 he speaks of *the* census, that is the great epoch-making census of A.D. 7. His statement is that our Lord was born when the first of these periodical enrolments was being made in Palestine (p. 127). This view of St. Luke's narrative agrees with the interpretation of St. Clement of Alexandria (pp. 128-9), who dwelt in Egypt and was familiar with the Egyptian system of periodic enrolments which prevailed there under the Roman Empire. Many of the actual census papers of these enrolments have been found,³ and the news of a fresh discovery reached Professor Ramsay on October 2 last (see Preface, p. x), of a paper belonging to the census of A.D. 20,

¹ By comparing Professor's Ramsay's conclusions with Bishop Wordsworth's note *in loc.* it appears that the Professor incorporates in his results the elements of truth contained in both of the only two interpretations which are, says the Bishop, 'conformable to grammatical laws.'

² See McClellan, p. 394; Gardthausen's contrary view shows 'a momentary loss of the historic instinct' (p. 103). Uhlhorn (*Conflict of Christianity*, p. 13) observes that this decree 'affords one of the plainest indications that the fulness of the time was come.'

³ Samples of them are given in the Appendix (pp. 276-80).

which has so completely confirmed his argument that part of his seventh chapter on Egyptian household enrolments is now unnecessary, and a sentence about 'no evidence' requires emendation on p. 161. In the following chapter we are brought more closely to St. Luke's narrative by the production of evidence which shows that there was a system of periodic enrolment according to a fourteen years' cycle in the province of Syria, and that the first enrolment was made in the Syrian year beginning in the spring of 8 B.C. (pp. 167, 170). It is possible further to show that this enrolment was probably delayed in Herod's kingdom for some time later, where Herod was not likely to carry out orders for an enrolment until he was forced to do so (p. 179). Professor Ramsay thinks that Herod was allowed to give a tribal character to the enrolment by way of soothing the Jews (p. 186),¹ and that the autumn of 6 B.C. was the date when the work was taken in hand (pp. 194-6). The important bearing of the year of our Lord's entrance in our flesh into the sphere of time upon the chronology of the Gospel narrative, and the duration of His life on earth is set forth in chap. x. (p. 197). Professor Ramsay reaches nearly the same conclusions on this matter as Mr. Turner in his article on the 'Chronology of the New Testament' in Dr. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*.² This is the more significant because he works on diverse lines from Mr. Turner. In two respects, it must be added, the Professor differs from Mr. Turner. He attaches a much higher value to St. Luke's statement as to the age of our Lord when he began to teach, and he sees nothing to recommend the view that the sacred ministry only lasted for one year (pp. 214-15). The result which he has obtained is confirmed by ancient and unconnected traditions (pp. 213-14), and coincides with the celebrated calculation of Kepler (p. 215). The statement of St. Luke that the first enrolment occurred while Quirinius was administering Syria is rightly discussed in a separate chapter (p. 227). It is undisputed that he administered Syria from 6 to 9 A.D., that the 'great enrolment' took place during that time. There is also evidence 'to show with practical certainty' that this was his second tenure of office in Syria (p. 228). Professor Ramsay closely scrutinizes the evidence bearing on the career of Quirinius in order to determine the date of that earlier administration (p. 230). He first shows that 4-3 B.C. is the latest year that Quirinius can have spent in Syria (p. 233), and then employs a line of reasoning, supported by the evidence of Suetonius, to show that most probably Quirinius, whose whole career is difficult and slippery, was administering Syria not later than 5-3 B.C., and possibly earlier (p. 236). Here Professor Ramsay is confronted by the facts which he frankly admits, that Quinctilius Varus, and Sentius Saturninus certainly governed Syria from 9 to 4 B.C. (p. 237), and his theory is that Quirinius was entrusted for two years with an extraordinary command in Syria (p. 238), a situation of affairs for which he quotes some analogous instances. He thus reaches the conclu-

¹ That is to say, not a Roman but a Jewish form was followed. So McClellan, p. 399.

² See the *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1898, p. 399.

sion th
6 B.C.,
nius w
Syria.
says th
first pe
chapters
tempor
most i
of ther
sion to
cohort
a cop
subject
sages
such a
John v
Messia
of the
contro
(p. 13
though
Turne
nology
of the
writing
who st
of St.
as 'too

The I
W
P
a
2
d

PROFE
succes
this bo
'Ar
charac

¹ I
of con
curiosi
quoted
Boswel
Creed,
tianity

² C
the wa
Ramsa

sion that the enrolment of Palestine took place under Quirinius in 6 B.C., when Varus was controlling internal Syrian affairs, and Quirinius was commanding the army and directing the foreign policy of Syria. Tertullian ignores the delay of the Palestinian enrolment, and says that it took place under Saturninus, who did in fact begin the first periodic enrolment of Syria in 8-7 B.C. (p. 244). In the final chapter some other difficulties found in St. Luke's references to contemporary history form a fitting conclusion to Professor Ramsay's most interesting study. We must be content with the bare mention of them. They are the famine of Claudius (p. 251), Gamaliel's allusion to Theudas and Judas (p. 252), and the reference to the Italic cohort in the history of Cornelius (p. 260). The Appendix contains a copy of seven important documents which bear upon the main subject of the book. We must say, lastly, that many interesting passages will be found on various details in the course of the argument, such as the allusion to the irony which makes the objectors in St. John vii. 40, 41 unconsciously bear emphatic witness in favour of the Messiah (p. 96), the note on the passages which describe the anointing of the Lord with the precious ointment (p. 91), the settlement of the controversy about the date of the origin of the Indictional system (p. 130), the importance of ascertaining a writer's whole train of thought (p. 191), the note on 'the fifteenth year of Tiberius,' on Mr. Turner's article mentioned above, and generally on St. Luke's chronology (p. 221); the allusion to Macrobius (p. 219),¹ the reckoning of the Actian era (p. 247), and the relation of St. Luke to the writings of Josephus (p. 257). We are sure that any candid reader who studies this work will think twice before he impugns the value of St. Luke's character as a historian, or regards Professor Ramsay as 'too optimistic' in his treatment (p. 48).²

The Preparation for Christianity in the Ancient World. By R. M. WENLEY, Sc.D. (Edin.), D.Phil. (Glas.), Regius Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan, Author of *Socrates and Christ, Aspects of Pessimism, Contemporary Theology and Theism*, etc. (Edinburgh: R. and R. Clark, Limited; London: A. and C. Black, 1898.)

PROFESSOR WENLEY may be congratulated on having been eminently successful in accomplishing the aims he set before him in writing this book. In the preface he says

'Amid the disappearance and shifting of old landmarks, so eminently characteristic of the day, it is incumbent upon Christians, and especially

¹ Dr. Mill (*Tracts*, chap. iii. p. 349) calls Macrobius 'a heathen writer of considerable eminence, a most diligent and learned collector of the curiosities of ancient literature.' Johnson 'suddenly struck in, and quoted Macrobius' in the course of conversation when only nineteen—Boswell (ed. Napier), i. 32. Macrobius is quoted by Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. iv. chap. 5, on the disuse of cremation as a result of Christianity.

² On St. Luke's 'gaps' (p. 41), the reader will do well to bear in mind the warning as to cautious application of that theory which Professor Ramsay gives in the *Guardian* for December 7, 1898, p. 1897.

upon young Christians, to lay firm hold upon the essential reasons for the superiority of their faith. One is well aware that to this end several, perhaps numerous, ways lie open. Among them, not chiefest by any means, but at least highly important, is that which I have tried to sketch here. Man's unaided efforts to raise himself into communion with God and their failure, leading at length to unparalleled moral obliquity and spiritual insolvency, cannot but afford fresh insight into the predestined deficiency of similar attempts at any time. The depth, nay, the awful horror, of the resultant crisis, and the marvellous tale of human regeneration through the power of the spirit of Christ must lead even the dullest soul to enlivened conviction and stimulated affection concerning that unique Personality who, at the first, faithful unto death in a life of loneliness such as no mortal man could have supported, at the last drew countless multitudes to Himself by the indwelling spell of His deathless divinity' (pp. v-vi).

He says also

'Except in an attempt to make the past vivid, these pages lay no claim to special originality. Processes are entirely suppressed, results alone appear' (p. v).

Thus the general line of thought is a familiar one. Many attempts have been made, with greater or less success, to show both the various ways in which preparation was made for the incarnation and the distinctive excellence of Christianity. The 'special originality' to which Professor Wenley does not lay claim would be difficult to reach in dealing with such a subject. But what may rightly be claimed for this book is the power with which it brings out the completeness of the failures which led up to the success of Christianity, joined with the vivid clearness with which the salient points of the pre-Christian systems are brought out. To mention as an illustration the second chapter, Professor Wenley has there put into twenty-four pages a clear and strong picture of Athens in the time of Socrates and of the life and work of Socrates, to which, on this scale and for the purpose which is here in view, we know no equal. And his account of the utter degradation which was the result of pagan civilization—an account which may have some special practical value at a time when attempts have been made to glorify and even to resuscitate paganism—depicts vividly historical facts which are too much forgotten.

The outcome of the book is summed up as follows :

'The value of careful study of the preparation for Christianity is to be sought most of all in the opportunities it affords us of clearly realizing the demands made upon Christ, the nature of His response, and its incomparable adequacy. Familiar with all these, what must our ultimate judgment be? This: "The Lord so ordained it that we should come to Jesus as to a great and good man, becoming infected with His spirit and imbued with love of Him as of a mortal being; and then, when He had caught our hearts as it were by guile, so that He had made Himself now needful unto us even as the very breath of our lives, then began He to say unto us, "Whom say ye that I, the Son of man, am?" And lo, trying our hearts, we began to perceive that this same Son of man, who had so given life to our souls, could be none other than the very Son of the living God"' (pp. 165-6).

2
of the
by M

St. P
T
S
b

THIS
the te
the a
author
logy o
to see
matic
have
in the
of the
our L
'the c
the hi

'for th
when
sacrifi
Pictur

In vie
Kenos
with t
conde
nature
dogma
tion th
ment

Su
carrie
though
of the
canno
of St.
the gu

W
Mr. S
Paul's
shows
(p. 27
of our
the In
this m

The Preparation for Christianity in the Ancient World is one of the volumes of the second series of *The Guild Library*, published by Messrs. R. and R. Clark, and Messrs. A. and C. Black.

St. Paul's Conception of Christ ; or, the Doctrine of the Second Adam. The sixteenth series of the Cunningham Lectures. By DAVID SOMERVILLE, M.A., Minister of Roseburn Free Church, Edinburgh. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1897.)

THIS is a learned and earnest attempt to present to modern thought the teaching of St. Paul about our Lord. It is vitiated, in spite of the ability and industry of which it shows many signs, by the author's attempt to consider the subject independently of the theology of the Christian Church. While he admits that 'it is not easy to see how' the work of the Church in arriving at 'the great dogmatic decisions of the Councils on the Person of Christ' 'could have been better done,' he speaks of the 'contradictions contained in the formula of Chalcedon,' and apparently approves of the 'effort of the Monophysites to make good the unity of the personal life of our Lord' (p. 22). He is of opinion that 'the final form given to' 'the dogmatic statements' about Christ 'made the understanding of the historic Christ an impossibility,'

'for the divine element in His Person had been defined in a way that when applied to the interpretation of the historic Christ involved the sacrifice of the human element and destroyed the naturalness of the Picture in the Gospels' (p. 23).

In view of the fact that the various forms of the 'theory of the Kenosis,' by which 'believing men' have attempted, 'in consistency with their faith in the Higher Nature of Christ,' to do 'justice to the condescension of divine grace in the assumption of our human nature,' probably involve an 'entire subversion' 'of the ancient dogma' rather than a 'development' of it, he expresses his conviction that there is nothing 'left to us but to return to the New Testament and recover if possible the intuition of the apostles' (pp. 24-5).

Such a method of study, however well meant and honestly carried out, is simply an abandonment of the helps to Christian thought which the Providence of God has appointed in the dogmas of the Universal Church ; and, as such, is foredoomed to failure. It cannot be expected that a clear and consistent view of the teaching of St. Paul can be obtained by those who are wilfully putting aside the guidance in the light of which Holy Scripture ought to be read.

We observe that in a note in the appendix to the second lecture Mr. Somerville says 'it is plain' that, whatever may have been St. Paul's own belief as to our Lord's birth from a virgin, his 'silence' shows 'that he did not attach any fundamental importance to it' (p. 272). He himself refers to the article entitled 'The Virgin Birth of our Lord' in Canon Gore's *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*. We would ask him to reconsider what he says on this matter in the light of Canon Gore's argument that 'St. Paul's

conception of the "Second Adam" postulates His miraculous birth,¹ and of his statement—

'Christ demands . . . a fundamental moral reconstruction of humanity, and He makes it possible because He offers to men a new life. He offers to reproduce in each man who will believe in Him and yield himself to Him the quality of His own life by the bestowal of His own Spirit. Himself the New Man, He can make all men new. But granted that in this fundamental sense Christ Jesus is a new moral creation, is it possible that this new moral creation can have involved anything short of a new physical creative act? Does not all we know of physical heredity, all we know of the relation of spirit and body, lead us to believe that the miracle of a new moral creation must mean the miracle of a new physical creation? If the moral character was new, must not the stuff of the humanity have been new too? Must not the physical generation of the Second Adam have been such as to involve at once His community with our nature and His exemption from it?'²

Mr. Somerville does not deny the supernatural character of our Lord's birth, and is certainly alive to such considerations as those thus pointed out by Canon Gore. That he has not fully weighed this line of thought is shown, we think, both by the sentence we have already quoted and by the later assertion of the

'harmony between Paul and John, the two great interpreters of Christ, in regard to the relative insignificance to religious faith in Christ of our belief on this subject' (p. 273).

Sursum Corda. A Handbook of Intercession and Thanksgiving.

Arranged by W. H. FRERE and A. L. ILLINGWORTH. (Oxford and London: Mowbray and Co., not dated.)

THIS excellent book contains a great variety of intercessory prayers and of thanksgivings. A very useful feature of it is the provision of schemes by the use of which persons to whom such a method is of service may have subjects suggested to them in a systematic form and may yet pray in their own words. It contains also a large number of well selected prayers for all ordinary needs. The part relating to thanksgiving is valuable. Altogether we can very heartily commend the book both to clergy and laity. Prefixed to it are an 'introduction' by Mr. Frere, an 'explanatory preface' by Mr. Illingworth, and a 'preface' by the Bishop of Rochester. From the last we make the following extract:—

¹ Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, p. 11.

² *Ibid.* p. 66. We observe that Canon Gore, preaching in Westminster Abbey on Christmas Day, said: 'The special interposition of God by which Jesus was born of a Virgin was not a portent without a meaning; it was a moral miracle. They knew how subtly our moral nature was wrought up into the very texture of our physical nature, and we could not, surely, deny that the new creation by which God restored the old creation to the primitive order and perfection intended for it postulated a physical miracle also. Without this miracle they could not conceive how that new creative act of God, the new man, the spot of perfect soundness, could have emerged into the heart of our sin-stricken race.' See the *Times*, December 26, 1898, p. 8.

'I hope that the little book may travel a way of peace. I think that there is nothing in it that should offend, and that it may be widely accepted, even if here and there some omit what others delight to use.

The Prayers for the Departed in particular are taken chiefly from ancient sources, and have the reserve and modesty which becomes those who remember our great ignorance, and in the lack of open revelation can do little more than mutely put before the mercy and care of God those whom, behind the veil, we think of, in that "holy keeping," to which we must so soon trust ourselves. The book, it will be remembered, is one of private devotion, and private devotion, guided by the precedents of antiquity, the practice of many loyal sons of the Reformed Church, and the instincts of the Christian heart, need not and will not bind itself by the austere rule of reticence which, under the strong stress of reaction from mediæval abuse, the Church thought well to impose upon herself in this respect in public worship. The matter is eminently one for the Apostolic rule of mutual toleration' (p. iv).

The Leading Ideas of the Gospels. By WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., Oxford; LL.D., Dublin; Brasenose College, Oxford; Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland. Third Edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1898.)

THE first edition of this beautiful book, based upon sermons delivered before the University of Oxford in 1870 and 1871, was published in 1872. After it had for some time been out of print a revised and much enlarged edition was published in 1892. A third edition, again revised and with a few additions, appeared last year. Since the second edition, from which this new edition does not substantially differ, was reviewed in our pages over six years ago,¹ it is unnecessary that we should now do more than thank the venerable author for his valuable work, and express our conviction that a careful study of the volume before us is likely to prove of great profit to those who are desirous of learning from the Gospels the lessons of which they are full.

Abraham and his Age. By HENRY GEORGE TOMKINS, late Vicar of Branscombe, sometime Rector of St. Paul's, Exeter; Member of the Committees of the Palestine and the Egypt Exploration Funds; Member of the Royal Archæological Institute, the Society of Biblical Archæology, &c. Author of *Studies on the Times of Abraham, The Life of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore*, &c. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1897.)

THE preface tells us that this is 'a revised and augmented form, 'with a slightly modified title,' of a book 'long out of print, published in 1878 (pp. v, xv). It contains much valuable matter on the details of the life of Abraham. It shows how the study of the monuments affords strikingly convincing indications of the historical character of that life as recorded in Holy Scripture. The author's 'endeavour' is 'to sketch in the background of the historical picture in which' Abraham 'is the central figure' (p. 5); and, in the course of doing so, he shows reason for his belief that 'the

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1892, pp. 491-3.

historic Abraham has a very good account of himself to give to the critical enquirer, which must fairly be explained away before the mythological Abraham can take his place' (p. 6). There are a number of plates, reproducing parts of monuments, and a coloured frontispiece of 'a royal Hittite.' Altogether we are able to commend the book, which forms the sixth volume of Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode's *Bible Students' Library*, as likely to be of great use to any who wish to study the historical setting of the age of Abraham or to consider one side of the evidence for the historical character of the Book of Genesis.

The Lord's Prayer. By the late E. M. GOULBURN, D.D., sometime Dean of Norwich. (London: John Murray, 1898).

THIS excellent book by the late Dean Goulburn contains a very complete and careful exposition of the Lord's Prayer and also some introductory chapters on its 'structure and completeness,' its 'context,' its 'sources,' and the 'two records' given in the Gospels. The substance of it, we are informed in the preface by Mr. Berdmore Compton, was 'originally delivered in the forms of sermons' which 'were frequently made use of, and carefully revised, by the late Dean, for the instruction of various congregations.' We can heartily commend the book for its accuracy, its sober judgment, its reverence and solid piety. It is likely to be of great use for spiritual reading, for supplying the matter of meditation, and as a help to those who have to instruct others in the meaning and use of the Lord's Prayer.

We should like to make many quotations, but must restrict ourselves to one from Dean Goulburn's chapter on 'the sources of the Lord's Prayer,' and one from a useful note added by Mr. Compton. In the former of these Dean Goulburn says:

'The craving after a sensational worship grows out of the same morbid habit of mind, and is another symptom of the general complaint under which, because it is in the air, we all more or less labour. The Church Services in their old form pall upon us; they have become to us, in process of time, dull, stale, flat, and unprofitable. We try to make them lively and to give them interest; and so far well. But alas! the interest which we seek to throw into these Services is chiefly derived from externals. Instead of endeavouring to perceive the intrinsic beauty of the Services in the first instance, in which case the appropriateness and meaning of the sober ritual of the Catholic Church would become apparent as we proceeded, we begin with externals because externals strike the eye or the ear (and so cannot but produce a certain impression), and, making these always more and more florid, we too often end by substituting a spectacle or a musical entertainment for the worship of God in spirit and in truth. But surely our subject teaches us a different lesson respecting the method of communicating interest to the Services of the Church. All these Services have upon them the stamp of primitive antiquity. But does their age at all deprive them of their force, their beauty, their significance? We believe it to be just the reverse. We believe that in these old forms (even as in the Lord's own prayer in a much higher degree) there is an exhaustless and ever fresh applicability, making them words for all time, for all generations

of Ch
seem
never
not in
who
Lord's
exper
to give
worsh
scholar
couch
reason
surface
wing.
Prayer
liturgy
never
single
and h
of it
might
read
very c
beaut
church
by th
Life,
borne
Rede
reflect
them
into t
Lord
Lord

In
ring
he sa
'In
of th
would
ment.
the re
facts.
observ
workin
on the
comm
of un
Gosp
narrat

Bis

THE
last is

of Christians, for all circumstances of the Church. What makes them seem stale to so many of us is that we do not really know them, have never studied them; that while their sound is in our ear, their sense is not in our heart. It is possible that, when our Lord gave to the disciple who said "Lord, teach us to pray" the priceless form known as the Lord's Prayer, some little feeling of disappointment may have been experienced by the applicant for instruction. "And is this all He has to give us? I have heard most of those words before in synagogue-worship, in the devotions issued by great rabbis for the use of their scholars. I anticipated something fresher, newer, more animating, couched not in the old stereotyped devotional phraseology." If he secretly reasoned thus, it was simply because he had yet never dived under the surface of the phraseology, but merely skimmed it, like a seabird on the wing. Hundreds do the same with the Offices of the Book of Common Prayer. With a laudatory fashion of talking about "our incomparable liturgy," they combine a profound ignorance of what is in it. They have never mastered the rationale or got an insight into the significance of a single Office of the Church. They have merely heard the Office used, and have taken up with the popular acceptance or the popular censure of it (both equally shallow). To give a single instance where a thousand might be given: who is there that has not heard the Burial Service read several times? And how many, even of those who have heard it very often, have any idea that in the three opening sentences there is a beautiful reference to the order in which the funeral procession enters the church? The first sentence being the voice of the Saviour, represented by the priest who leads the procession, "I am the Resurrection and the Life, saith the Lord;" the second being the voice of the dead, who is borne into the church immediately after the priest, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc.; and the third being the voice of the mourners, reflecting on the transitoriness of worldly wealth and glory, and resigning themselves to God's will under the bereavement, "We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord" (pp. 51-4).

In Mr. Compton's note to a statement by Dean Goulburn referring to 'the second occasion of giving the Lord's Prayer' (p. 61) he says

'In a sermon, or popular treatment of the Lord's Prayer, a discussion of the correctness of the view that the Lord's Prayer was given twice would be out of place. And the Dean states his own view without argument. There are dangers in accounting for a diversity of testimony in the relation of similar facts by the supposition of the independence of the facts. There are also dangers in the contrary direction, when shallow observers lose sight of one of the greatest and deepest principles of God's working, viz., the doing things at twice, with most significant variations on the two occasions. The latter dangerous tendency has more easily commended itself to less thoughtful people, and has often been the cause of unjustifiable accommodations of the original texts of the different Gospels, as well as the loss of the special lessons of the diversities in the narratives such as are here pointed out by the Dean' (p. 62, note 1).

Bishop Walsham How. A Memoir. By **FREDERICK DOUGLAS** How. With a Portrait. (London: Isbister, 1898.)

THE rapid sale of this biography from its appearance on October 21 last is an indication of the interest taken in the life of Dr. How by

a very large number of his fellow-countrymen. The Bishop was a good rather than a great man. His life was sanctified by deep sober piety rather than illuminated by flashes of genius, and his restful continuance in the happy mean seemed somewhat to rob him of the kind of boldness which belongs to the spirit of extremes. Such a man lives as a rule an uneventful life, and even Mr. How's filial affection is able to keep the Bishop's memoir well within five hundred pages of large type. Dr. How was not a great combatant in the arena of religious controversies, nor did he take a large part in the transaction of general public affairs. He was engaged indeed in better, higher work, and we shall not, we trust, be at all considered to be undervaluing the blessed influences of his life if we say that this memoir is necessarily reviewed in a Short Notice, by reason of the absence of such materials as would call for the longer treatment of an Article.

William Walsham How was born at Shrewsbury on December 13, 1823, and was educated at Shrewsbury School and Wadham College, Oxford. His hymn-writing began before he was thirteen, and he showed an early love for botany (cf. p. 448). As an undergraduate he wrote a letter to a younger brother in reference to Confirmation, which indicates the writer's religious earnestness at that time. 'Often renew your solemn vow privately and solemnly, and always renew it by attending the Sacrament when you can. You have my prayers for you, and may God bless you' (p. 19).

His first curacy was under Mr. Claughton, of Kidderminster, a place which, like Leeds and Wantage, became famous as a sphere of parochial training. In 1846 'all things' connected with the ordination examination in the diocese of Worcester were 'done in a very indecorous, off-hand, careless way,' not to speak of the ordination itself (p. 29); but with Mr. Claughton the young clergyman passed the time of his diaconate in an atmosphere of clerical zeal and moderate Anglicanism which left a mark on the whole fifty years of his ministry. After two or three years spent at Shrewsbury with his father—during which he married, and wrote the first volume of *Plain Words*—he was instituted to the rectory of Whittington in the diocese of St. Asaph, where he remained for twenty-eight years, from 1851 to 1879. In addition to the ordinary work of a diligent pastor in a parish of 1,500 people, containing numerous hamlets and outlying farms and cottages, and schools which were visited every morning, Mr. How made time to write further volumes of *Plain Words* and the well-known *Commentary on the Four Gospels*, to do much fruitful work in conducting Quiet Days and Missions, and to undertake the office of Rural Dean, which involves little or much work according to the view of the man who holds the post. In 1867 he made a speech at the Wolverhampton Church Congress in which he set forth 'the Anglican position' against extremes on both sides, and from this time he became well known in the Church of England. In 1868 he was elected Proctor in Convocation, and worked hard on numerous committees, and in 1879 was consecrated suffragan bishop for East London, with the title of Bishop of Bedford. The generosity of Mr. Richard Foster placed Stainforth House, at Upper

Clapton
began
his en
and p
succes
(p. 17)
tween
bishop
took p
cheap
receiv
year.
Lond
East
more
which
the str
other
has a
the ac
bishop
which
most
publis
sense
I valu
matter
tionat
sympa
adequ
(p. 22)
tions
streng
the ag
forme
North
labour
import
more
fluenc

¹ T
lege al
moven
gulf to
the bri
² T
³ C
his tic
should
him hi
VO

Clapton, at the Bishop's disposal for his official residence. Dr. How began his work in East London when he was fifty-six years old, but his energy soon gained him a warm place in the hearts of both clergy and people, and the stages of the process are fairly epitomized in the successive descriptions of him as 'a bishop, the bishop, our bishop' (p. 173), as 'a bridge-maker' between Church and Dissent and between East and West London (p. 197),¹ and as 'the children's bishop' (p. 418).² He made free use of tramcars and omnibuses,³ took pains to know the clergy and their families, and even visited the cheap lodging-houses to speak to their transitory occupants. He received about 15,000 communications by post in the course of a year. Perhaps the chief business matter in connexion with his East London work was the part which he took in the machinery of the East London Church Fund (p. 161). We will only mention two more matters under the East London part of Dr. How's life, both of which produced a characteristic letter from Dr. Temple: one showing the strength and firmness of the Archbishop that was to be, and the other revealing, what all know and some have experienced, that he has a big heart. Dr. Temple considered that it was necessary for the administration of his huge diocese to regard Dr. How as suffragan bishop for the whole and not for East London only. The letter in which Dr. Temple explained his position is, we believe, one of the most powerful statements of a strong case that can be found in any published letter in the language (pp. 210-11). Dr. Temple's deep sense of justice led him to say before the letter closed, 'God knows I value your work, and I reverence your character.' The other matter was the death of Mrs. How, and Dr. Temple's 'most affectionate' letter to his 'brother' on this occasion both shows what the sympathy of a strong man can be, and also contains a concise but adequate tribute to the good work of Mrs. How in East London (p. 224). We do not know where we could find two better illustrations of the Archbishop's combination of the two Johannine traits of strength and tenderness than in these two letters. It was in 1888, at the age of sixty-five, that Dr. How undertook the work of the newly formed see of Wakefield. No higher praise of his episcopate in the North could be given than to say, as we heartily can say, that he laboured there as his life in East London led men to expect. The important additions were that at Wakefield the Bishop occupied a more independent position in diocesan work, a wider sphere of influence for the exercise of his great gifts of personal religion, and had

¹ The present writer heard Dr. How speak in the Hall of Keble College about fifteen years ago in the early days of the University Settlement movement. The Bishop used words to this effect: 'There is a mighty gulf to be bridged over between East and West London, and blessed are the bridge-builders.'

² This he 'liked best' (p. 404).

³ On his last day in East London a tram conductor asked him for his ticket, saying, 'P'raps you won't be coming with me again, and I should like to keep it for a remembrance.' The Bishop afterwards gave him his photograph (p. 176).

closer dealings with the work of legislation. The efforts of mediation which he had put forth in East London during the dock strike found abundant room for further activity in the coal strike in Yorkshire. His refusal of the see of Durham—supported by a sturdy letter from Archbishop Temple to the effect that the work at Durham was no better worth doing, possibly even less so, than that at Wakefield—is at once a proof of his affection for Wakefield and of his freedom from the spirit of place-seeking (p. 313). The one event of national importance in the Bishop's Wakefield life was the composition of the hymn 'O King of Kings, whose reign of old.' The complete account of this hymn, with facsimiles both of words and tune, is a matter of special interest (pp. 351-9), adding greatly to the attraction of the volume. Chapters are devoted to the Bishop's hymn-writing¹ and his other literary work (pp. 381, 410), to his favourite recreations, which were fishing and botany (pp. 432, 448), and to his letters on spiritual matters (p. 460). Among these will be found passages on prayers for the dead (p. 465); on the remarriage of divorced persons, giving opinions of Bishop Wordsworth and Dr. Temple as well as his own (p. 475); and on confession (p. 476). Our last word will be a reference to a grave matter which underlay the witty verses in which the Bishop replied to a request that he would sanction some 'slight irregularity—trivial in itself, but illegal' (p. 167). The verses themselves have been much quoted, and it is not necessary to transcribe them here. It is enough to say that they were based upon the principle that many things which cannot be formally sanctioned may yet be done without making a fuss about them. For good or for ill, and more frequently, we believe, for good than for ill, that is the principle on which many bishops of our day have proceeded, and if the principle is acted upon with loyalty to the Prayer Book and common sense we cannot but think that it conduces to good administration. The episcopal biographies of the last twenty years make a good comment upon the theory that all Anglican bishops were fast asleep until Sir William Harcourt 'arose' to write his famous letters in the *Times*.²

The Spiritual Needs of Oxford. (City and Rural Deanery.) A Paper read before the Ruridecanal Chapter on November 10, 1898, in Brasenose College Hall. By the Rev. HORACE E. CLAYTON, M.A., Rural Dean. (Oxford: Bridge and Co., 1898.)

THE average Oxford man, in the ordinary acceptance of the term, knows no more of the spiritual condition of the city and rural deanery of Oxford than of the transformation scene effected by St. Giles's fair in the depths of the Long Vacation. We are glad, therefore, to be able to notice this paper by one of the leading parochial clergymen of Oxford as a means of diffusing knowledge of an unknown

¹ An instance of fine poetic insight in connexion with the interpretation of two lines in 'Crossing the Bar' is given on p. 407. Compare a word of criticism on Mr. Kipling's 'Recessional,' on p. 366.

² See especially the epistle on 'The Awakening of the Bishops' in the *Times* of December 29, 1898.

subject
of cour
brethre
sense o
the par
aim for
Clayton
parochi
schools
the hist
he cons
vision i
and wh
mentio
(caused
the exc
streets,
as a wh
by a ter
of causi

Phases
Fo
Ed

We are
Pigou's
flatter t
ant exam
most gl
in their
by seas
mixture
certain
cures in
for som
in Paris
Halifax,
such as
light an
record o
close, fr
bishops
on the t

¹ On
stitution
Review
Dictiona
biguous,
ship, del
evident

subject among Oxford men. Mr. Clayton's immediate purpose was of course of a more local character. He desired to move his clerical brethren in the important deanery over which he presides to a deeper sense of the needs of the Church in the city, with a view to action on the part of the citizens as required. This is obviously a very proper aim for a Rural Dean in such an important town as Oxford.¹ Mr. Clayton first takes a general review of the present conditions of parochial work in his deanery, its area and population, its churches, schools, burial-grounds, clergy, and communicants. He then traces the history of church building in Oxford during this century. Lastly he considers what new churches and schools are needed, what provision is made for the clergy—in many cases miserably inadequate—and what are the chief hindrances to Church work in Oxford. He mentions the growing separation of the richer and poorer inhabitants (caused by removals into North Oxford), the lax observance of Sunday, the excessive number of public houses, the bad behaviour in the streets, and the problem of the College Servants' Sunday. The paper as a whole is a most excellent one, and if its force is slightly lessened by a tendency to scold, Mr. Clayton twice disclaims any intention of causing offence to his clerical brethren.

Phases of my Life. By FRANCIS PIGOU, D.D., Dean of Bristol. For some time one of Her Majesty's Chaplains. (London: Edwin Arnold, 1898.)

We are at a loss to conceive for what purpose such books as Dean Pigou's *Phases of my Life* are written, unless they are designed to flatter the personal vanity of their authors. It is true there are abundant examples of writers—the notorious A. K. H. B. is, perhaps, the most glaring of them—who assume that the most ordinary incident in their commonplace existence interests the outer world, and who, by seasoning their vapid chronicles with an indiscriminate intermixture of stories, stale and fresh together, captivate readers of a certain class. But from a man who has held at least two prominent cures in the Church, and been appointed to two deaneries, we look for something better. Dr. Pigou's wide experience of men and things in Paris and London, his tenure of the vicarages of Doncaster and Halifax, his selection for the conduct of many important functions, such as quiet days and parochial missions—what precious lessons of light and leading might not the world reasonably anticipate from the record of such a career, mellowed in the calm retreat of a cathedral close, from whose tranquil deanery Dr. Hook sent forth his *Archbishops of Canterbury*, and Burgon his fiery and nervous monographs on the text and translations of the New Testament? Yet we have

¹ On the history of the office of a Rural Dean, see Makower's *Constitutional History of the Church of England* (cp. *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1896, p. 91), and a short popular Article in Mr. Cutt's *Dictionary of the Church of England*, p. 532. Amid much that is ambiguous, surely to summon quarterly gatherings of the Chapter for worship, deliberation, and mutual edification at the Ember seasons, is an evident way in which a Rural Dean can be useful to the Church.

searched in vain this book of nearly four hundred pages for one original thought, one useful morsel of information, or one really helpful word. Stories, good, bad, and indifferent—some old as the hills and often spoiled in the telling—trivial personalities, trite observations, and well-worn truisms are plentiful enough; but scant indeed is the store of anything higher or better, and what there is of them appears seriously incongruous with the bulk of the volume.

The story of Dean Pigou's childhood and his school and college days fills the first hundred pages of *Phases of my Life*, and we can deliberately affirm that not a line of them was worth the writing. At Ripon, Cheltenham, Edinburgh, and Trinity College, Dublin, the future dean was equally undistinguished, and his course in no way differed from that of other ordinary boys. Having taken a Dublin degree, he sought for a title to Holy Orders, and the choice of a diocese leads to some critical remarks about bishops—a favourite theme of discussion in his subsequent pages. In the chapter entitled 'My First Curacy' Dr. Pigou introduces some questions concerning them, the last of which runs thus: 'Does he [*i.e.* the bishop] live in an atmosphere of flattery and sycophancy, like a piece of turtle in turtle soup?' What charming and appropriate imagery! A piece of turtle living in an atmosphere of sycophancy! A few lines further he adds the profound remark, 'There are bishops and bishops. I have had some experience of them, and have come to the conclusion that not all are *fathers in God*, in the sense which those words imply' (p. 111). Of Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford, who gave him his 'Title,' the writer has nothing new to say, but he fills some space with telling what everyone knew already. From Stoke Talmage he passed to the Paris chaplaincy in the Avenue Marbœuf, where the Duchess of Cambridge and her family were occasional worshippers, and the acquaintance thus formed with royalty probably explains his promotions in after years.

We suppose some taint of egotism inevitably attaches to any form of autobiography; but as there is no subject on which men are so eloquent as self, so there is none which betrays more surely the tone and temper of a writer's character. A few brief quotations will illustrate this point. 'Marbœuf Chapel was in my time thronged to excess' (p. 157). 'I have for many years past given lectures to the working classes, *which are always enjoyed*' (p. 144). 'Archbishop Thomson used to pay me this compliment: "I always go to Pigou for" (hymn) "books and tunes"' (p. 147). 'Preaching for the sufferers in the Indian Mutiny, I think I may say there were few, if any, not moved to tears, and strong men felt the lump in the throat' (p. 170). 'I am afraid we three' (*i.e.* Bishop Wilkinson, Stopford Brooke, and himself) 'drew largely from St. James's and St. Martin's parish churches' (p. 230). 'I invited some of the most famed and popular preachers from time to time to occupy the pulpit of St. Philip's. Very few of my *invités* made any sensible difference in the congregation' (p. 238). But enough of such extracts. They are cast into yet stronger relief by boastful and repeated references to the cathedrals and large churches attended by the *élite* of society (as we are

careful
pendix
has ple
becom
further

It i
much
secrets
cincts
relate
poorer
we lea
mortal
is with
correct
his rel
he kne
enhanc
in his

Wi
compl
why th
Halifa
Was u
pleasa
or eve
tol?
candid
minist
and gr
sphere
acquir
the ac
many
and de
discuss
most f
our de
depths

Dante
A
F
M

In thi
histori
probab
refuge
da Po
earlier

carefully informed) in which the writer has preached, and an appendix restates these and adds a list of the charities whose cause he has pleaded. We wonder whether St. Paul's exclamation, 'I have become a fool in glorying,' ever crossed the Dean's mind, with the further thought that no man had compelled him.

It is an irritating trick of writers of this stamp to suggest how much more they could tell if only they were free to do so. What secrets, if not of royalty, yet of things connected with the royal precincts; what anecdotes and stories, the Dean ejaculates, 'I could relate of bishops I have known for the last forty years.' How much poorer the world must be for the constraint so inopportunistically imposed we leave to the imagination of the reader. Yet, arguing as ordinary mortals will from the known to the unknown, we can appreciate what is withheld by stories which the author thinks worthy of printing and correcting for the press. How kindly, how judicious, for example, is his relation of a sermon by Bishop Fraser, whom the Dean tells us he knew intimately! How genial to recall something that cannot enhance his friend's memory a dozen years after he has been laid in his honoured grave.

With Dr. Pigou's more serious interludes we are not always in complete accord. There is another version than his of the reasons why the seat of the new bishopric was placed at Wakefield instead of Halifax, but we did not expect to find it given in *Phases of my Life*. Was unwillingness to be 'a figure-head and a dummy,' as Dr. Pigou pleasantly describes the post now filled by Dean Randall, the only or even the chief reason of his desire to be transferred to Bristol? Nor do we accept his unqualified recommendation that candidates for Holy Orders should spend the first years of their ministry in some of our larger towns. Time for study and thought and gradual experience of men is more easily found in a less bustling sphere, and it is in village cures that such men as Dean Church acquired much valuable training. Upon the self-revelation made in the account of the Doncaster Mission we do not dwell. It suggests many searching questions which go deeper than matters of sobriety and decorum. But we must frankly confess that we shrink from their discussion when they are sandwiched in, as here, between pages of the most frivolous jocosity. Of nine-tenths of Dean Pigou's book it is our deliberate verdict, that although there may possibly be greater depths of futility, we think they very nearly touch the bottom.

Dante at Ravenna. A Study. By CATHERINE MARY PHILLIMORE, Author of *Studies in Italian Literature, The Warrior Medici, Fra Angelico, Selections from the Sermons of Padre Agostino da Montefeltro*, &c. (London: Elliot Stock, 1898.)

In this attractive volume Miss Phillimore has collected all that is historically known, and much that rests upon mere conjecture or probability, concerning Dante's closing years, passed in his last refuge at Ravenna, under the protection of its lord, Guido Novello da Polenta; a period in many respects more interesting than the earlier days of his exile, inasmuch as after the stormy vicissitudes of

fortune and the disappointment of all his hopes of return to the much longed for Florence, he had now reached his final earthly haven of repose. We like to think of him as he sinks to rest, the object of reverent affection and esteem, cheered by the company of his children, the society of cultured friends, and the assurance of lasting fame.

Miss Phillimore's frequent visits to the Romagna and Ravenna have, as she says, enabled her, while following in Dante's footsteps, to form—and, we may add, to give her readers—some idea of the charm which that part of Italy and the ancient city itself must have held for the poet. She draws a vivid picture of the place, its churches and mausoleums, strange and mysterious mosaics, and round Bell Tower; and reminds us that in the poet's time the river Padenna still flowed through the city, whereas 'neither tide of river nor of population now animates the silent, grass grown streets, and some of the great relics of the past have either yielded to the slow decay of centuries, or have been rudely swept away by the desolation of civil warfare.' And she dilates upon the grandeur of the celebrated Pineta, pointing out how well Dante's description of 'La divina foresta spessa e viva' in the Terrestrial Paradise¹ accords with its scenery.

An interesting chapter upon the Polenta family; the tyrants of other cities in the Romagna, referred to in Canto xxvii. of the *Inferno*; and the Popes contemporary with Dante, completes the setting of the picture in which he is the most conspicuous figure. And we now turn with pleasure to the portions of the book which deal with his pursuits and experiences.

We think that Miss Phillimore is well warranted in supposing that the poet first took up his abode in Ravenna in the year 1317, the next after his host, Guido da Polenta, had been elected lord of the city. If so, he had but four years of life then before him. Miss Phillimore (taking Boccaccio's statement that Dante in Ravenna had many scholars in poetry, and particularly *nella volgare*—in the vulgar tongue; which is followed by Saviozzo of Siena, and Manetti, one of the early biographers of Dante, and supported by a codex in the Laurentian Library, cited by Bandini) supposes, not only that Guido induced him as Professor of Rhetoric, but that the fragment of his treatise *De Volgari Eloquentia* which has come down to us embodies the lectures which he delivered in that capacity. She admits, however, that 'there is no actual historical record that' 'Dante occupied the rhetoric chair,' and that 'this throws us back upon the probabilities in favour of his having done so.' For ourselves, we own that we share Scartazzini's and Carducci's scepticism upon the subject.² But whether or not they are in the right in this respect, we are entirely of Scartazzini's opinion that the *De Volgari Eloquentia* was composed in or about the year 1308, and soon after the *Convito*. This is not the place for a discussion on this question; we must be

¹ See *Purgatorio*, Canto xxviii.

² Scartazzini's *Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia* (1890), pp. 149, 150; Carducci, *Studi Letterari*, 2nd ed., p. 251

conte
passa
about
more
treati
conta
whole
as a s
the J
vanni
extan
neith
accur

W
Philli
porat
of the
the o

S
the J
says,

Para
furth
tion
furth
phras
Virgi
imita

much
is, ho
Ede
dicat
idea

read
abstr
the m
had
tiniu

Latin
vulga
with
Cant

By th
Purg

1
2

content with pointing out that Scartazzini relies upon the very same passage in *Convito*, i. 5, lines 65-68,¹ as showing that Dante was about to write the treatise in the year 1308, upon which Miss Phillimore founds her conclusion that he wrote it after 1317. The treatise is, in fact, essentially a book, not a course of lectures; and contains internal evidence that it was intended to be a connected whole, written in four parts. As well might the *Convito* be regarded as a set of lectures. No doubt Boccaccio says that Dante composed the *De Volgari Eloquentia* within a few years of his death; and Giovanni Villani suggests that the fact that only two of its parts are extant may be accounted for by the author's sudden death: but neither of these embellishers of facts can be relied upon for historical accuracy.

We consider it, however, a fortunate circumstance that Miss Phillimore thinks otherwise; for her readers owe to this the incorporation with her pages of an excellent and well illustrated summary of the somewhat dry treatise, which is much pleasanter reading than the original.

She is on far surer ground when she assigns the completion of the *Paradiso* to these last four years of the poet's life. As Carducci says, 'Scarcely had the pen been raised from the last verses of the *Paradiso*, when the soul of Alighieri, as though it had nothing further to do with the world, was, according to the graceful imagination of his friends, gathered into the bosom of Beatrice.'² We are further indebted to Miss Phillimore for a full and scholarly paraphrase of the poetical Latin correspondence between Giovanni del Virgilio at Bologna, and Dante at Ravenna, intended by them as an imitation of Virgil's *Eclogues*, but which they resemble about as much as chalk does cheese. Search through their crabbed numbers is, however, well rewarded. To quote Carducci again, 'I love these *Eclogues* because they give me a glimpse here and there of some indication upon which I can exercise my fancy in reconstructing an idea of Dante's life in Ravenna.'³ We must refer those of our readers who are not acquainted with them to Miss Phillimore's abstract of their purport and contents. Suffice it here to say that the main object of Giovanni del Virgilio was to dissuade Dante, who had finished the *Inferno* and the *Purgatorio* in Italian, from continuing the poem with a *Paradiso* also in that language, instead of Latin, which he urges him to adopt. Dante refuses to abandon the vulgar tongue, and expresses his longing to be crowned in Florence with a poet's laurel wreath, when he shall have finished his final Cantica:

'Quum mundi circumflua corpora cantu
Astricolæque meo, velut infera regna, patebunt,
Devincire caput hedera, lauroque juvabit.'

Ecl. i. 47-49.

By the 'infera regna' we are to understand both the *Inferno* and *Purgatorio*, and to remember that the Cantiche describing them were

¹ The reference is to the Oxford Dante.

² Carducci, *Studi Letterari*, 2nd ed., p. 246.

³ *Ibid.* p. 250.

already compiled. This premised, we subjoin Miss Phillimore's spirited version of the lines :

'When my songs relate
How planets circle round the heavenly gate ;
Of souls in bliss the sweet estate shall tell
As of those left in Purgatory or Hell ;
Then shall the bay and laurel intertwine
To crown my brows.'

Further on in the same *Eclogue*, Dante speaks of a favoured solitary sheep, with whose milk he intends to fill ten vessels which he will send to 'Mopsus' (his poetical name for Giovanni del Virgilio).¹ By these ten vessels full of milk, ten further cantos of the *Paradiso* are signified.² Space forbids us from dwelling longer upon these *Eclogues* ; but they contain many pathetic touches and reminiscences both on the part of 'Mopsus' and of 'Tityrus' (Dante).

In her chapter upon Dante's Life and Pupils at Ravenna, Miss Phillimore quotes from still extant sonnets by his host, Guido da Polenta, which, as she says, 'prove that he was no unworthy follower in the footsteps of his great master.' In one of these, a sonnet to his lady, he speaks of 'l'onesto sguardo e 'l dolce riso ;' words evidently adapted by him from 'l'onesto riso e 'l dolce gioco' of *Purg.* xxviii. 96. Other figures that pass before us are those of the great Giotto, summoned to Ravenna by Dante at the instance of Guido ; Rainaldo Concoregio, then Archbishop of the city ; Dino Perini, a fellow exile from Florence with Dante, and who is a character introduced as 'Melibceus' in the *Eclogues* to which we have referred ; Piero di Giardino, the notary ; Menghino Mezzani, the rhymester ; Fiducio de' Milotti, the companion of Dante's walks in the Pineta ; Niccolo Carnevalli, Achille Mattarelli, and Bernardo Canaccio, who afterwards composed the well-known epitaph inscribed on Dante's tomb, beginning 'Jura Monarchiæ, Superos, Flegetonta, lacusque Lustrando cecini, voluerunt fata quousque.'³ Miss Philli-

¹ *Ecl.* i. 58-64.

² We may conjecture that Canto xxiii. was one of these. For there, in lines 55-57, Dante declares that he could not attain to the thousandth part of the truth, in singing of the sanctity of Beatrice's smile and aspect,

'If all those tongues should now their sound outpour,
Which Polyhymnia and her sisters made
Most fat with milk, the sweetest of their store.'

Haselfoot's Translation.

³ *A propos* of the numerous epitaphs composed from time to time for Dante's tomb at Ravenna, and recorded by Miss Phillimore, we notice a mistranslation in the sixth and last one, at page 205, made by Cardinal Valentino Gonzaga in 1780. In this the words

Danti Alighiero

Guido et Hostatius Polentiani
Clienti et Hospiti peregre Defuncto
Monumentum fecerunt

are rendered :—'To Dante Alighieri . . . dead in a foreign country, Guido and Hostasio Polenziano, his *patron* and *host*, erected this Monu-

more
she p
Beatr
a dis
has
Donat
T

by th
Guid
cacci
F
tomb
mov
we m
them
add t
as fin

A
emph
prosp
endur
illustr
the b
1322,
Dante
temp
would
same
by tre
strain

Spiri

I
V
(

THE
keyno
the su
for th
Conn
practi
part o
power
the S
It is s

ment.
'clien
sugge
and g
erecte

more has something to tell us about all these worthies. From them she passes to Dante's children, three of whom—Pietro, Jacopo, and Beatrice—were with their father in his closing years. She observes a discreet silence upon the fact, on the reason for which conjecture has been so rife, and so baffled, that Dante's wife, *née* Gemma Donati, who survived him, did not accompany them.

The end came on September 13, 1321: whether or not hastened by the fatigues of Dante's alleged embassy to Venice on behalf of Guido da Polenta, who can say? Miss Phillimore quotes Boccaccio's account of the last scene.

For the honours paid to the dead poet, the description of his tomb and the varied fortunes of his remains, their surreptitious removal and their recovery, and other interesting posthumous details, we must again refer readers to the book itself, which we can assure them will from first page to last well repay their perusal, and will add to the stock of knowledge even of many who regard themselves as finished Dante scholars.

A word in conclusion. The uncertainty of human affairs, exemplified by the contrast between the high promise of Dante's early prospects, and the persecution by his fellow citizens, which he endured from his maturity down to his death in exile, was further illustrated very soon after that death by the misfortunes which befell the benefactor who gave him his last refuge. At the end of March 1322, Guido da Polenta, who had gone to Bologna soon after Dante's death and was still there, was elected in his own city to the temporary office of Captain of the People. At its expiration he would have returned to Ravenna, but that on September 20 in the same year Ostasio, his cousin, had made himself master of the city by treachery; and Guido, after vain attempts to recover it, was constrained to return to Bologna, where he died in 1330.

Spiritual Apprehension. Sermons and Papers. By the Rev. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A., Cambridge; Hon. D.D., Durham; Vicar of Kirkby Lonsdale, and one of H. M. Chaplains. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1898.)

THE title of this new book by Mr. Llewelyn Davies supplies the keynote of its contents. The most marked thought in it is that of the superiority of the spiritual faculties to the intellectual faculties for the work of acquiring knowledge of God and spiritual truth. Connected with this central thought there is much moral and practical teaching of a very helpful kind. The most remarkable part of the book is the sermon on 'The wisdom of men and the power of God,' which was preached at St. Mary's, Nottingham, on the Sunday before the meeting of the Church Congress of 1897. It is significant to find a Broad Churchman protesting against the

ment.' Guido and Ostasio were two separate persons, and the words 'clienti et hospiti' are in the dative case, in apposition to 'Danti.' We suggest as an amended version:—'To Dante Alighieri . . . their client and guest, dying in a land not his own, Guido and Ostasio of Polenta erected this Monument.'

attempted reconciliations between theology and science which are much in vogue. In opposition to the line of thought which, since the publication of *Lux Mundi*, has been rapidly growing in popularity in the Church of England, he insists that it may by no means be taken for granted that, under present conditions, 'all the wisdom of men, including the latest science and criticism,' can have a place in 'the Gospel of the Cross' (p. 6); and he calls attention to the truth, on which we have often had occasion to dwell in these pages, that the conclusions of the human reason are not to be regarded in such a way as would be appropriate if it had attained to that power which it is hereafter to possess:

'The effect of what I have been saying is to discourage the confident persuasion that what science discovers and reason infers must be in harmony with what the Gospel declares. That hereafter, when the reason has been made a match for the spirit, this persuasion will be justified, I cannot doubt; I can hardly imagine a Christian not cherishing it as a faith and hope for the future. But at present it seems to be appointed, for the sake of the supremacy of the spirit over the reason, that the reason should be baffled and put to confusion' (p. 9).

In reading this book we have often found ourselves disagreeing with the writer. Especially in what he says in the preface about the *Quicunque vult*, we think he forgets that if truth is to be accurately preserved it needs to be expressed in clear and dogmatic language as well as to be made the subject of prayer and meditation. It is well indeed

'so to dwell on the significance of the divine names, the Father, the Son, the Breath of the Father and the Son, as to be drawn into a sense of an inconceivable Unity in the Eternal Nature' (p. viii).

The capacity to do so, in our judgment, largely depends on the maintenance of dogmatic statements such as those of the *Quicunque vult*, the use of which, as 'unlike' 'to the theology of the Gospels and Epistles' (p. vii), Mr. Davies regrets.

Yet the careful reading of *Spiritual Apprehension* by those who have a firm hold on the Catholic Creeds may be of service in promoting a state of mind which will use dogmatic truth in a right way, and make it ethically fruitful.

Mr. Davies will no doubt of deliberate judgment retain in any future edition much which we dislike. We ask him to consider whether his meaning would not really be better expressed if he were to alter the word 'prejudice' in the sentences;

'that open and direct prejudice against riches which the Lord Jesus entertained and expressed' (p. 247);

'He sought to encourage what we might call a prejudice against' 'money' 'in the minds which were open to His teaching' (p. 248).

Hymns and Hymn Makers. By the Rev. DUNCAN CAMPBELL, B.D. (London: A. and C. Black; Edinburgh: R. and R. Clark, 1898.)

'I'd rather have you whistle a Scotch tune,' said Dr. Johnson when inconveniently pressed in argument by Boswell,¹ and we have no

¹ Boswell's *Johnson*, iii. 232 (ed. Napier.)

doubt but that our readers will agree with us in preferring this pleasant little book for hymn lovers to many more ponderous works of Presbyterian divinity. Dr. Julian's Dictionary is not within the reach of all, and, as we have not been unmindful of the student of hymnology in the past,¹ we feel the more at liberty to dwell upon a popular, cheap, accurate,² entertaining, and instructive work. Mr. Campbell has specially examined and tabulated the contents of six hymn books—*The Church Hymnary*, recently issued by a joint committee of Presbyterian bodies, *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, *The Scottish Hymnal*, *Church Praise*, *The Congregational Church Hymnal*, and *The Presbyterian Book of Praise*.³ He gives also a list of some works of hymnology which may be profitably consulted, and includes in his work some interesting results of correspondence with hymn authors. After an introduction in which such matters as the definitions of a hymn by St. Augustine and Dr. Johnson are discussed Mr. Campbell takes up his subject for the most part in chronological order, and talks pleasantly enough about Greek, Latin, English, German, and American hymns and hymn-writers. There are many little informal biographical accounts of the famous men of hymnology, and many illustrative details concerning the occasions on which well known hymns were composed. Mr. Campbell's environment has led him to make several remarks which do not harmonize with all that we know of sacramental life in the English Church—for example, with regard to Ken and Keble on p. 34—and it is unreasonable to expect Mr. Campbell to avoid an occasional mistake when he is guessing at the popularity of the usage of distinctively Church of England hymns (p. 147). But these little points do not seriously mar the general excellence of Mr. Campbell's comments, and we give high praise to his generous appreciation of good work, his ready recognition of literary and religious beauty in the compositions which he criticizes. A fine example of this is the very worthy notice of John Mason Neale (p. 114). Most just also are the comments on Heber's Trinity Sunday and Missionary hymns. Certainly 'Holy, Holy, Holy' 'has the simplicity and the dignity of the best ancient examples. It has nothing of the subjective element in it, but is pure adoration' (p. 68). As for the noble composition which Mr. Campbell ranks second to Dr. Watts's 'Jesus shall reign,' 'From Greenland's Icy Mountains,' written on the eve of Whitsunday in 1819, contains a stanza of surpassing grandeur in the lines, 'Waft, waft, ye winds, His story.' In spite of one or two rhythmical defects and jarring phrases in 'The Church's One Foundation' we are convinced that Mr. Stone's hymn has done more than any other single thing written in this century to teach the English people what the Church of Christ really is, and we are glad

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. xxxv. pp. 89, 240; No. lvi. p. 457; No. lxii. p. 505; No. lxviii. p. 433.

² But Epworth is a rectory, not a 'vicarage,' and can hardly be called 'near Lincoln,' being thirty miles north-north-west (p. 43.)

³ Mr. Campbell also makes an appreciative reference to *Church Hymns* (p. 133).

to read Mr. Campbell's quotation from a letter by the author that when it was written 'the steadfast defence of the faith made by Bishop Gray, of Capetown, against the heresies of Colenso some time before was much in my mind' (p. 153). We do not altogether agree with Mr. Ellerton's remark on Bishop Wordsworth's hymns quoted on p. 92: 'To read one of his best hymns is like looking into a plain face, without one striking feature, but with an irresistible charm of honesty, intelligence, and affection.' Surely the two striking features of Bishop Wordsworth's best known hymns, for Ascension-tide and All Saints, are the grand swing of his favourite lengthy metre, and the remarkable exhibition of the unity of all Scripture in his use of type and symbol from every part of the Bible. It is curious to notice how many writers, whose other verses have sunk into oblivion, are remembered by one great hymn; how diverse is the doctrinal position of the writers of the great hymns which have touched the heart of the world; how various are the details of their lives. Mr. Campbell does not shut out the writers whose hymns are almost entirely unknown, and gives us a lively account of John Berridge, whose father sent him to college, to be a light to the Gentiles, when he found that he was unable to form any practical idea of the price of cattle, and who wrote three hundred and forty-two Songs of Zion to prevent a long sickness from preying on his spirits (pp. 47-8). As we can hardly ever refer to Dr. Hatch in these pages without opposing his ecclesiastical theories we are glad to endorse what Mr. Campbell says about the deep, unaffected piety of the verses in his posthumous volume, *Towards Fields of Light*. It deserves to be better known, especially for its verses on All Saints' Day, which Mr. Campbell does not quote. We rejoice to think that hymns do something to promote the unity of Christendom, to draw a little closer together those lines which here seem to be almost parallel, but which, as we know, must meet, as the mathematicians say, at an infinite distance, before the Throne. We prefer such a thought as this to any reflection upon a motley group which might fairly be made upon Mr. Campbell's picture of 'unity in diversity,' when it occurs to him to bring together the hymn-writers of almost any modern hymnal (Pref. p. xxvi).¹

Rex Regum. A Painter's Study of the Likeness of Christ from the time of the Apostles to the present day. By Sir WYKE BAYLISS, F.S.A., President of the Royal Society of British Artists. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1898.)

THIS tribute of ardent devotion 'to the King of kings' is beautifully illustrated, and is dedicated by permission to her Majesty the Queen. The distinguished author is well known as the most accomplished

¹ Mr. Campbell refers to the *Dies Ira* as 'the most sublime and awe-inspiring composition in the whole range of hymnology' (p. 21), but does not refer to the assiduous care which the Rev. C. F. S. Warren has bestowed upon the criticism of the numerous English versions (99 British and 135 American) of this awe-inspiring hymn (*The Dies Ira*: Skeffington).

paint
on th
exper
further
who h
will b
Mr. I
folio
publi
artist
Sir W
much
upon
said
our I
of CA
know
doubt
work
are a
illustr
Han
Rena
draw
relics
not h
We c
devot
subje
know
deals
round
up th
has b
own
the f
what
which
ment
of Ca
in the
on th
all ex
religi
fesse

1
tium,
2
passa
Atom

painter of ecclesiastical interiors in Europe, and as a high authority on the subject of mosaics. He brings, therefore, a very wide personal experience of sacred art to his present subject, and has had the further advantage of intimate friendship with the late Mr. Heaphy, who had made the Likeness of our blessed Lord a special study. It will be remembered by many of our readers that the work which Mr. Heaphy produced upon this subject formed the contents of the folio edition of *The Likeness of Christ*, edited by Sir Wyke and published by David Bogue. Since the time of that publication the artistic treasures of the Vatican have been made more accessible, Sir Wyke has both verified the researches of his friend and also done much original work; numerous books bearing more or less directly upon the subject have appeared, and in particular all that can be said has been said, and very eloquently, against the authenticity of our Lord's Likeness in the Dean of Canterbury's book on *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*. We need not possess a technical knowledge of Art to learn much from Sir Wyke's present book. No doubt the trained artist will recognize the cogency of parts of the work which are beyond the grasp of the ordinary reader. But we are all able to enjoy the extreme beauty of these carefully executed illustrations, chiefly reproduced from the photographs of Franz Hanfstaengl in the case of the pictures of the great Masters of the Renaissance and of living painters, and from Mr. Heaphy's accurate drawings in the British Museum in the case of transcripts of ancient relics. *Rex Regum* 'contains no example of the Likeness that has not been drawn or reproduced directly from its original' (p. xx). We can all listen also with respectful attention to the poetry and devotion of Sir Wyke's prose. He lays stress on the fact that his subject is not the likenesses but the Likeness of Christ, and that our knowledge of the Likeness is reached through the likenesses. He deals with the subject of the Likeness in its ancient form and surroundings, and with the evidence of its authenticity. Then, taking up the history of the Likeness after a thousand years, he shows what has been done with it by the great painters, including those of our own time. Finally he sums up the argument with an aspiration that the face of Christ shall never fade from our eyes. Do we, then, know what that Face was like, the Face of 'the mild Son of Man,'¹ through which the rays of divine glory stream,² alike in mercy and in judgment? In answering this question Sir Wyke Bayliss and the Dean of Canterbury stand entirely opposed to each other. The Dean is in the awkward position of being obliged to conduct the controversy on the painter's ground, and is entitled to that sympathy which we all extended to Professor Huxley when he took up the cudgels in religious controversy against a trained theologian. It must be confessed also that Sir Wyke is not always quite happy in his expressions

¹ *The Christian Year*, Quinquagesima, stanza 13; cf. *Lyra Innocentium*, viii. 8, stanza 3.

² 2 Cor. iv. 6. On the 'Face of Christ,' in addition to a well known passage in Manning's Anglican Sermons, see Milman's *Love of the Atonement*, p. 191; Newman, *Serm.* viii. 229.

when he touches upon strictly theological matters.¹ The Dean, quoted on p. 11, answers the question in the emphatic negative. He says that, 'whatever may be written to the contrary, it is absolutely certain that the world and the Church have lost for ever all vestige of trustworthy tradition concerning the aspect of Jesus on earth.' Sir Wyke does 'write to the contrary' with equal emphasis, and deals very fully with the Dean's objections. We do not see how the Dean can successfully meet the arguments which have been brought against his view, though we should not be disposed to speak so strongly upon the evidence as Sir Wyke's enthusiasm leads him to speak. That evidence, however, is weighty, and its cumulative force is great, coming from the simple portraits of the catacombs, the mosaics of the basilicas, the representations of the sufferings of the Redeemer by the early painters, the pictures of the Masters of the Renaissance. There are just fifty illustrations altogether in the volume. These 'likenesses' are, in the glowing language of Sir Wyke's concluding passage, the petals of the White Rose of the 'Likeness' which the painter lays at his Master's feet as a tribute of love and praise, as he joins with the sculptor, the poet, the architect, and the musician in giving glory to the Lamb.²

The Life of Saint Hugh of Lincoln. Translated from the French Carthusian Life and edited, with large Additions, by HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. (London: Burns and Oates, 1898.)

THE work of this Jesuit editor of Saint Hugh's life proceeds upon the basis of a large assumption, the truth of which we are as far as possible from admitting. According to Father Thurston the fact that St. Hugh was a Carthusian and admitted the authority of the Pope in the twelfth century is tacitly assumed to be equivalent to the position of a modern Roman Catholic, who accepts all the novel claims and the later accretions of Vaticanism.³ We need not stay to

¹ He means no ill, of course, when he says that 'the manhood of Christ was visible *apart from* the Godhead' (p. xxii), and he must not be taken too literally when he asserts his belief that 'the Likeness of Christ must stand or fall with Christianity' (*ibid.*). A good many similar undesirable phrases might be quoted.

² Many useful references for the study of this subject will be found in the foot notes to Bishop Westcott's essay on the 'Relation of Christianity to Art' (*Epistles of St. John*, p. 329, ed. 2). A special section on 'Portraits of Christ' occurs in the introductory essay of *The History of Our Lord* as exemplified in works of art, commenced by Mrs. Jameson and concluded by Lady Eastlake, i. 31 (ed. 3, 1872). We cannot part from this fascinating subject without expressing our regret that the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review* can no longer be adorned with the accomplished criticisms of the late Rev. R. St. John Tyrwhitt on such a book as Sir Wyke Bayliss has now published.

³ As much stress used to be laid on the fact that the actual registration of Barlow's consecration is missing, as in the case of many of his undoubtedly consecrated contemporaries, it may be desirable to note that the original of St. Hugh's profession of obedience to his Metropolitan does not appear to have been preserved at Canterbury (p. 604). Father Thurston does not suggest on this account that St. Hugh did not make

point o
facts of
unhisto
the val
Life of
Mr. Di
to trac
perhaps
Bishops
features
Carthus
striking
Nationa
ston ta
of the
picture,
a Bene
the port
as Fath
identifi
aureole
has one
domina
but the
portrait
already
press, b
He has
written
himself
preface
been on
been ad
the ind
bare enu
They wi
the volu
teresting
with Ad
Dimock
de Lion
in Engla
the usual
contentio
¹ See
No. lxxx
d'Avalon
History
many sm
in Engla

point out how very far such a supposition is from being true to the facts of history, but we must observe that Father Thurston's curiously unhistorical imagination in this respect has led him to depreciate the value of the late Archdeacon Perry's generally accurate, if dry, *Life of St. Hugh* (Preface, p. xix). He speaks with more approval of Mr. Dimock's work (*ibid.* pp. xix-xx). It will not be necessary here to trace again¹ the outline of the life of the Bishop who was perhaps, when all things are considered, the most capable of all the Bishops of Lincoln. It will be sufficient to describe the special features of Father Thurston's work, and its relation to the French Carthusian Life. The frontispiece is a photograph of a picture of a striking head of a 'white monk,' by Lodovico da Parma, in the National Gallery, which on somewhat slight evidence Father Thurston takes to be St. Hugh of Lincoln. Doubtless the catalogue of the National Gallery is in error in confusing the Hugh of this picture, with its Carthusian habit, with St. Hugh of Grenoble, who was a Benedictine; but we should rather say that 'it is probable' that the portrait is one of Hugh of Avalon than 'there can be little doubt,' as Father Thurston's wish leads him to think. The evidence for the identification consists of the name, the habit, a crozier, and an aureole (p. 624). The happy possessor of the French Carthusian Life has one or two fine views of the Minster on the 'sovereign hill' which dominates the far extending distances of the level county of Lincoln, but the present biography is embellished by the doubtfully authentic portrait alone. The English version of the French biography had already been made, and had become the property of the Manresa press, before the duties of editorship devolved upon Father Thurston. He has, however, made very many changes in the version, he has rewritten parts of it, and especially in the later chapters he has allowed himself considerable latitude in dealing with the French original. The preface and appendices and parts of the text of the French Life have been omitted, and about two hundred pages of fresh materials have been added. These additional topics are fortunately summarized in the index under the heading of 'additions by editor,' and the bare enumeration of them occupies about eight columns of the index. They will be found to occur both in the text and in the foot notes of the volume. The index also enables us to find our way to many interesting details which the Life of St. Hugh provides in connexion with Adam the Monk, the Carthusian Order, the works of Mr. Dimock and Archdeacon Perry, Henry II., John, and Richard Cœur de Lion, Archbishops Baldwin and Hubert, the position of the Jews in England, liturgical matters, and the monastery of Witham. The

the usual profession, and the bearing of this argument upon the Roman contention about Barlow is obvious. Compare Palmer *On the Church*, ii. 343.

¹ See the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. xvii.; compare No. lxxv. p. 103, No. lxxxix. p. 180, No. xc. p. 472. We have not seen *Saint Hugues d'Avalon*, by C. Bellet. The concise Life of St. Hugh in the Diocesan History of Lincoln (S.P.C.K. 1897), p. 97, is by Archdeacon Perry. For many small details see Canon Wordsworth's *Notes on Mediæval Services in England*, p. 157.

editor's principal aim has been to dwell upon those features of St. Hugh's life which bear specially upon English history or institutions or localities, such as perpetual vicarages, grants of churches, the right of sanctuary, the buildings of Lincoln—cathedral, Jewry, and leper hospital—the site of the house in London where St. Hugh died, and the tomb where his body was first laid. The editor contributes one or two new facts to the substantial history of St. Hugh's career. He gives reasons (pp. 348, 617) for supposing that St. Hugh had a close personal connexion with the famous monk of Eynsham who saw visions of the other world, and he produces further evidence in support of the contention of the French biographer that St. Hugh really came to England in 1180—that is, five years later than Mr. Dimock and all subsequent English writers supposed (pp. 99, 599). Some of the editorial comments are bold withal, and a eulogistic description of Archbishop Baldwin by Dr. Stubbs is said to be not warranted by the evidence (Preface, p. xvi). We cannot regard the present volume as the final contribution to the Life of St. Hugh, for in several obvious matters Father Thurston does not give us complete information, does not, indeed, sufficiently marshal facts when he has opportunities for doing so. We should have been glad to see in such a Life of St. Hugh some attempt made to trace the debt which the Church in England owes to Burgundy, a debt in which the names of Felix and Hugh occupy a large place.¹ And we should have welcomed a list of those parishes where a bell was named after St. Hugh,² and of those in which a peal of bells was rung on St. Hugh's Day long after the Reformation, with an appended note on a nice point for the exercise of Father Thurston's ingenuity, whether the peal in question on November 17 was rung because it was St. Hugh's Day, or because it was the anniversary of Queen Elizabeth's accession, or because a great No-Popery demonstration occurred on that day in 1679.³ It would perhaps call uncomfortable attention to the continuity of the English Church to inform Father Thurston of a further detail for his appendix on 'St. Hugh in Art'—that a figure of St. Hugh has been placed in the window of the private chapel of the Bishop at Lincoln.⁴ We may in conclusion further illustrate this continuity by saying that if there was a daily celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Hugh's cathedral, which is much to be wished, we should have the prophecy of Dr. Neale fulfilled in all the matters in which fulfilment is desirable:—

'Again shall long processions sweep through Lincoln's minster pile;
Again shall banner, cross, and cope gleam through the incensed aisle;
And the faithful dead shall claim their part in the Church's thankful prayer,

And the daily Sacrifice to God be duly offered there;
And Terce, and Nones, and Matins shall have each their holy lay,
And the Angelus at Compline shall sweetly close the day.'⁵

¹ See Plummer's *Bede*, ii. 432.

² For example at Stow and at Corringham.

³ See Perry's *St. Hugh*, p. 358.

⁴ The interesting archæological history of this building is described in the *Guardian*, October 10, 1888.

⁵ We quote the whole stanza, but must express our full mind by

For
we will
edition
the see
Hugh
glory of
and Co

The Re
CH
Fre
Go
189

THE tra
three ch
Virtues,
of mem
Father
theology
theology
the eva
much ap
us say,
necessar
with the
character
of the
English
distincti
grounds
The ch
poverty,
spires, a
by quot
gela of
religious
to the b
increase
of the re
study of
they wir
is most
of our I
founded
Gay pas

adding t
incorpor
no desir
used in I

W
VOL.

For the benefit of readers who do not possess the French Life we will add that the divisions of the book in Father Thurston's edition are : I. From the birth of St. Hugh to his election to the see of Lincoln. II. The first years of episcopacy. III. St. Hugh of Lincoln and Richard of the Lion Heart. IV. The glory of the Saint before and after death. V. Appendices, Index, and Corrigenda.¹

The Religious Life and the Vows. A Treatise by Monseigneur CHARLES GAY, Bishop of Anthédon. Translated from the French by O. S. B. With an Introduction by the Rev. W. T. GORDON, Priest of the Oratory. (London : Burns and Oates, 1898.)

THE translation here presented to English readers is a rendering of three chapters of Monseigneur Gay's work on the Christian Life and Virtues, which has met with much approval in France at the hands of members of religious orders and other devout Christian people. Father Gordon thinks that Monseigneur Gay has made ascetical theology attractive, as Father Faber was able to make dogmatic theology attractive, and we have no doubt that these chapters on the evangelical virtues of poverty, chastity and obedience, will be much appreciated by minds of a certain mould—by those persons, let us say, who look upon an annual 'retreat' as an expedient if not a necessary part of their spiritual exercises, and who are more familiar with the tone of foreign books of devotion than with the works of characteristic English religious writers. There is a little too much of the narrow precision of the seminary about these chapters for English Churchmen in general. The Introduction strikes a note of distinction between 'precepts' and 'counsels,' enlarging upon the grounds and scope of the 'counsels' of God in the law of grace. The chapter on 'holy poverty' treats of the nature of religious poverty, the obligations imposed by it, the mode of life which it inspires, and the motives on which the practice of it is founded, illustrated by quotations from the life and writings of St. Francis de Sales, St. Angela of Foligno, St. Catherine of Sienna, and the founders of great religious orders. Chastity is regarded as the respect paid by the soul to the body, a respect arising from the love of God, and desiring an increase of union with Him. The first part of the discussion treats of the respect which man owes to himself, and this is followed by a study of the Divine perfections, which strengthen that respect because they win and hold man's heart. The subject of obedience to God is most properly based for all Christians upon the perfect obedience of our Lord's human life. The principles on which obedience is founded and regulated are considered first, and then Monseigneur Gay passes to the 'graces contained in obedience,' the advan-

adding that we are quite satisfied that Matins and Evensong sufficiently incorporate the best parts of Terce, Nones, and Compline, and we have no desire to see the Angelus, or any other modern Roman devotions, used in English churches.

¹ We have noted no defects of type, except on p. xix.

tages which it procures for the soul, and the duties imposed by it. As an example of the writer's style, and as a convenient epitome of his teaching, we may, in conclusion, quote his own summary on obedience :

'We are greatly mistaken if the spirit innate in every Christian has not constantly borne witness throughout this treatise to all the truths set forth, and to the large number of rules herein established. They are so clear, simple, wise, and beneficent, above all, so well founded, that no objection can certainly be found to them ; and if the intellect makes no objection, how can the heart resist? No one should make a schism between love and light. What we see to be true, let us love ; the good that we love let us do. Obedience is the necessary homage of the creature to the Creator ; it includes and puts its mark on his whole religion ; it constitutes his true justice, and causes him to love individually and socially ; it makes him good, wise, free, holy, and happy, and by a short and infallible way guides him to perfection and salvation. Let us, then, give to God this glory, to Jesus Christ this proof of love, to the Church this joy, to our communities this brightness and strength, and to our own souls this inestimable advantage of a perfect, unanimous, and lasting obedience' (pp. 262-3).

The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer (Globe Edition). Edited by ALFRED W. POLLARD, H. FRANK HEATH, MARK H. LIDDELL, and W. S. McCORMICK. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1898.)

If the 'Globe' Chaucer had appeared three years earlier it would have been welcomed without drawback or qualification as an unrivalled boon for all lovers of our first great English poet, seeing that it would have been the first critical text of his works published in a single volume, and at a price that brings them within the reach of all who would be likely to read them. That honour, however, has been secured by Prof. Skeat's admirable one-volume edition, and with that it is inevitable to compare the no less admirable edition now offered to us by Mr. Pollard and his coadjutors. Both editions, as it happens, owe their origin to a single source. Thirty-five years ago Mr. Alexander Macmillan invited Mr. Aldis Wright, Mr. Earle, and Mr. Henry Bradshaw to co-operate in the production of a 'Library' edition of Chaucer, to be published by the Clarendon Press (with which Mr. Macmillan was then closely connected), and to be followed by a 'Globe' edition in a single volume. The scheme was admirable, but none of the proposed editors succeeded in making substantial progress with it. After various vicissitudes, however, and after several permutations and combinations of editors, it has at last born excellent fruit. The two portions of the scheme parted company. Professor Skeat, single-handed, brought the library edition to completion in his epoch-making 'Oxford Chaucer,' while Mr. Pollard, with three competent assistants, has been equally successful with the 'Globe' edition. But meanwhile the former relations between Messrs. Macmillan and the Oxford University Press had been severed, and hence it was natural that the latter should follow up their large edition by the production of Professor Skeat's text in a single portable volume ; whence arises

the
confr

In

the te

by a

is ful

prime

fessor

and p

various

copied

perha

the n

schola

that

editio

work

reader

to com

TI

Pollar

Messrs

the L

sible

Chauc

and C

contri

he de

the m

who w

have l

'Glob

For

devote

labour

publis

is cle

knowl

Chauc

own a

reads

opinio

very li

have n

vocabu

The p

neglect

read h

Chauc

or Mrs

the *embarras de richesses* with which the would-be student is now confronted.

In plan, both editions are naturally much alike. Both consist of the text of Chaucer's works, with selected various readings, preceded by a preface and followed by a glossary. Mr. Pollard's introduction is fuller in biographical details (based on his own excellent little primer to Chaucer), and in information as to the manuscripts; Professor Skeat gives a very useful sketch of Chaucer's grammar, metre, and pronunciation. Mr. Pollard supplies a fuller apparatus of various readings; Professor Skeat's glossary is very much more copious. Professor Skeat has the advantage in paper, binding, and perhaps in type; but whereas his volume is published at 7s. 6d., the nominal price of Mr. Pollard's is only 3s. 6d. In quality of scholarship both are excellent. Professor Skeat's text is, of course, that for which he laid the foundations in his great six-volume edition; but Mr. Pollard's is equally the result of independent work by men who are specialists and experts in the subject. The reader, therefore, is safe with either; and the scholar will have to consult both.

The division of labour in the 'Globe' edition is as follows. Mr. Pollard, who has already edited the *Canterbury Tales* separately for Messrs. Macmillan, naturally undertakes them again, together with the *Legende of Good Women*; Professor Liddell (of Texas) is responsible for *Boece*, the *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, and the doubtfully Chaucerian *Romaunt of the Rose*; Professor McCormick for *Troilus and Criseyde*; and Dr. Heath for the minor poems. Each editor contributes a short Introduction on the text of the poems with which he deals, Dr. Heath's being noticeable for his elaborate *stemmata* of the manuscripts, constructed after the German fashion. For students who wish to occupy themselves with the text of Chaucer, but cannot have Professor Skeat's larger edition by their side, this feature of the 'Globe' edition is specially valuable.

For the general reader the gain from all the work which has been devoted to Chaucer during the last third of a century (and here the labours of Dr. Furnival and the Early English Text Society in publishing all the best manuscripts should be gratefully remembered) is clear and unquestionable. No one with any literary taste or knowledge has any excuse now for not being acquainted with Chaucer. Those whose reading does not go beyond the poets of their own age will of course never care to know him; but no one who reads Shakespeare because he likes him, and not because public opinion makes it necessary, need be afraid of the older poet. A very little practice (with the assistance provided by the editors we have named) will make him master of the difficulties of metre and vocabulary, and then he is free of a country of rich literary delight. The present generation, which delights in a story, cannot afford to neglect the prince of story-tellers; and to read him aright you must read him in his own language. The day for 'modernizations' of Chaucer is past, even if the adaptors be Dryden or Pope, Wordsworth or Mrs. Browning. We now have sound, systematically edited texts,

prepared by scholars who have trained themselves specially for the work. The difficulties of comprehension vanish as soon as they are confronted; and to those who are weary with the work and the problems of modern life and modern literature we can recommend no healthier or more refreshing tonic than the inimitable story-telling of Chaucer.

Reply to the attack of Earl Beauchamp. Some account of the positive teaching of *Creed and Life*.¹ Two Sermons preached by the Rev. C. E. BEEBY, B.D., on Sunday, October 30th, 1898. (Published by the Committee of the Congregation of Christ Church, Yardley Wood. To be obtained of Mr. S. R. Barrett, Hon. Secretary of the Congregational Committee, Heathfield, Valentine Road, King's Heath, Birmingham; and of the Rev. C. E. Beeby, Yardley Wood Vicarage, Warstock, Birmingham.)

IN our last number we reviewed the two editions of Mr. Beeby's book entitled *Creed and Life*.¹ In the course of our review we quoted a number of passages, giving in each case the exact reference, which formed part, though part only, of the ground for our statement that the teaching contained in the book is of an heretical character and is contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. It appears to be Mr. Beeby's practice when he is charged with teaching false doctrine, to say that he is misrepresented by the separation of statements he has made from the context in which they were written. If any of our readers is suspicious that we have done Mr. Beeby injustice we hope he will examine carefully the passages to which we have referred, reading in each case the whole context.

The *Reply to the attack of Lord Beauchamp* simply confirms our previous judgment on Mr. Beeby's book. It does not supply the slightest indication that Mr. Beeby holds the doctrine of the Church of England on the subjects about which he has been attacked. It is not to the point to say that his opinions are shared by Archdeacon Wilson, or Canon Gore, or the writers in *Lux Mundi*, or the Bishop of Ripon. What is needed is some clear statement of the truths affirmed by the Creeds.

It has been supposed by some that the condemnation of the heresies taught and published by Mr. Beeby is confined to High Churchmen, and that they have acted merely from party motives. The refutation of any such idea is supplied by Mr. Beeby himself in the pamphlet before us. The Dean of Worcester and Canon Melville are not commonly reckoned extreme men in a High Church direction, and their condemnation of *Creed and Life* as recorded in this pamphlet is of the strongest kind.

If Mr. Beeby were a private individual his opinions would not call for much public notice. It would be sufficient to say that he appears to have got out of his depth as a thinker, and to have meddled with questions which need greater fulness and accuracy of knowledge than he shows signs of possessing. But when it is remembered that he holds a benefice in the Church of England, it is

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1898, pp. 257-62.

necess
Wood
deadli
It is a
ous act
is at th
either
of his
prepar
Whate
the rea
that b
nothin
our du
possibl
retain
to con
not on
the con
authori
need to
act of
in the
and re
distinct

A His
GEO

THIS v
Edmun
already
It incl
period
high se
while
Elizab
idea th
of Bo
of 'ver
Sir Ric
are enu
says, 'f
far as
none b
istics t
chapter
(p. viii
is pack
writing
can do

necessary for more to be said. So long as he remains vicar of Yardley Wood and gives utterance to his present opinions, heresy of the deadliest kind is being taught by an official teacher of the Church. It is a matter which unquestionably calls for the prompt and vigorous action of his diocesan. It may be that the Bishop of Worcester is at the present time privately taking action with a view to obtaining either a retraction of his book from Mr. Beeby or the resignation of his benefice. Possibly, if this is not the case, the Bishop may be preparing wise and strong measures of a more public character. Whatever inferences the course of events may have suggested as to the reasons for his apparent inaction, it would be unjust to suppose that because the public knows nothing of his doings he is doing nothing. Yet in the publicity which the matter has attained, it is our duty to point out with the strongest emphasis that it will be impossible for the Bishop of Worcester, if he allows it to pass by, to retain the confidence of orthodox Churchmen. To suffer Mr. Beeby to continue his present teaching in his present position would be not only to give offence to scrupulous souls and cause some to leave the communion of the Church of England, and to lessen the moral authority of the episcopate at a time when the hands of the bishops need to be strengthened in every possible way; it would also be an act of unfaithfulness to our blessed Lord. For Mr. Beeby has denied in the plainest terms not only the Virgin Birth and sinless nature and resurrection of our Saviour, but also that He is in a true and distinctive sense very and eternal God.

A History of Nineteenth-Century Literature (1780-1895). By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)

THIS volume takes up the history of English literature where Mr. Edmund Gosse's work (1660-1780) left off, Mr. Saintsbury having already given us a *History of Elizabethan Literature (1560-1665)*. It includes 'no living writer, except Mr. Ruskin,' but it covers a period in which 'the proportion of names of the first, or of a very high second class, is distinctly larger than in the eighteenth century'; while 'the bulk of literary production is infinitely greater than in the Elizabethan time' (Preface, pp. v, vi). Mr. Saintsbury disclaims the idea that his volume is 'a Dictionary of Authors' or 'a Catalogue of Books,' and he acknowledges that there are many omissions, even of 'very favourite books and authors' of his own. Among these Sir Richard Burton, Laurence Oliphant, John Foster, and Mr. Reeve are enumerated (p. vi). As to principles of criticism, Mr. Saintsbury says, 'I have attempted to preserve a perfectly independent, and, as far as possible, a rationally uniform judgment, taking account of none but literary characteristics, but taking account of all characteristics that are literary' (p. vii); he has reserved for the concluding chapter 'what may be called connecting and comprehensive criticism' (p. viii). It is not easy either to praise or blame this book. That it is packed full of valuable information about authors and their writings, and gives ample proof of wide and patient study, nobody can doubt for a moment, but at the same time it exhibits an air of

superiority—one might say, of self-confidence—which to some readers and students will be distasteful. There can be no question about its utility and convenience and accuracy as a book of reference, but there will be wide differences of opinion as to the estimates which the author makes of the various writers. Probably all will agree with Mr. Saintsbury in the high value which he puts upon Sir Walter Scott, but a great many will not feel as he does respecting Shelley and Thackeray, if that involves any depreciation of Wordsworth and Charles Dickens. What strikes us as the best feature in the book is the concise and pregnant criticisms of the less-known writers in the earlier part of this period: Mr. Saintsbury often hits off their merits or their failures in a single sentence or epigram which is well worth remembering; but at other times his criticism is a little too caustic, not to say in many cases unmerited. It may raise a smile in the reader, but it is seen to be prejudice, and occasionally it does not quite agree with what has already been or is afterwards said of the particular writer. A few specimens of Mr. Saintsbury's criticisms will illustrate what we have observed. Of Shelley he writes, in reference to *Prometheus Unbound*, 'the first poem which distinctly showed that one of the greatest lyric poets of the world had been born to England.' 'But it is in Shelley's smallest poems that his greatest virtue lies. Not even in the seventeenth century had any writer given so much that was so purely exquisite'; and after enumerating some of these poems, he adds, 'This long list, which might have been made longer, contains things absolutely consummate, absolutely unsurpassed, only rivalled by a few other things as perfect as themselves' (p. 85). We cannot think that Mr. Saintsbury's views of Shelley will be generally endorsed. Of Samuel Rogers he says, 'It may be questioned whether Rogers ever wrote a single line of poetry' (p. 92). Those who know his *Italy* will hardly admit this to be fair criticism. Of Walter Savage Landor he says, 'Supreme genius Landor had not. His brain was not a great brain'; 'but he had the faculty of elaborate style as no one since the seventeenth century had had it, and as no one except Mr. Ruskin and the late Mr. Pater has had since' (pp. 102-3). Of Thackeray he says, 'Of mere story, of mere plot, Thackeray was not a great master,' 'but in the creation of living character he stands simply alone among novelists: above even Fielding, though his characters may have something less of massiveness; much above Scott, whose consummate successes are accompanied by not a few failures; and out of sight of almost everyone else except Miss Austen, whose world is different, and, as a world, somewhat less of flesh and blood' (pp. 154-5). Of De Quincey he says—

'Even at his very best, he was not a writer who could be trusted to keep himself at that best. His reading was enormous—nearly as great perhaps as Southey's, though in still less popular directions—and he would sometimes drag it in rather inappropriately. He had an unconquerable and sometimes very irritating habit of digression, of divagation, of aside. And, worst of all, his humour, which in its own peculiar vein of imaginative grotesque has seldom been surpassed, was liable constantly to degenerate into a kind of laboured trifling, inexpressibly ex-

asper
be cr
(pp. 1

M

to ru

attem

'Dev

read

writer

influe

The p

Jeffre

Willia

maga

of gr

with

are d

what

the g

ment

litera

Turn

not v

that

book,

In re

'coul

Grote

Gree

great

be' (

and

und

Maca

226-7

contr

novel

Move

His e

fair;

theolo

'O

and s

ably r

chara

thing

But h

thoug

'T

the m

holdin

asperating to the nerves. He could be simply dull ; and he can seldom be credited with the possession of what may be called literary tact' (pp. 196-7).

Most people will feel that Mr. Saintsbury has allowed his prejudice to run wild here, and that he is conscious of it may be seen by his attempt to 'hedge' in the next paragraph. The chapter on the 'Development of Periodicals' (pp. 166-210) is one that will be read with peculiar interest, for it brings together a mass of names of writers in these days little known, except in literary circles, whose influence upon modern English prose-writing has been enormous. The present generation knows very little of such 'giants' as Francis Jeffrey, William Hazlitt, John Wilson, Edward Fitzgerald, and William Maginn, whose early efforts have given rise to that flood of magazine and review literature which nowadays swamps the study of great books. The chapter on the Historians also will be read with pleasure, for it is appreciative of men to whom modern writers are deeply indebted. Of Lingard it is said, 'He was the author of what still retains the credit of being the best history of England on the great scale, in point of the union of accuracy, skilful arrangement, fairness (despite his inevitable prepossessions), and competent literary form' (p. 215). Among other things we are told that Sharon Turner 'was more of a specialist and particularist, and his style is not very estimable' (p. 215); that 'Alison is not quotable' (p. 218); that 'this last indeed' (Milman's *Latin Christianity*) 'is a great book, and will probably live. For Milman here really *knew*' (p. 219). In reference to Histories of Greece, William Mitford, we are told, 'could not keep his politics [Tory] out of his history' (p. 215); Grote and Thirlwall 'must live in literature' by their Histories of Greece; the former 'has absolutely no style: its scale is much too great'; the latter 'is seldom picturesque, and indeed never tries to be' (p. 222). Macaulay is praised for 'his extraordinary reading and memory, his brilliant but rather tyrannical conversation, his undoubting self-confidence,' but 'a poet of the very highest class Macaulay was not'; his poems are spoken of as 'popular' (pp. 226-7). This criticism is fair enough, and forms a favourable contrast with Mr. Saintsbury's treatment of the early poets and novelists. We must pass on now to his estimate of the Tractarian Movement, and then look for a moment at his general conclusion. His estimate of Pusey, Keble, and Newman appears to us eminently fair; he, of course, treats of them as men of letters merely, not as theologians.

'Of its three leaders, Pusey—whose name, given to it in derision and sometimes contested by sympathizers as inappropriate, unquestionably ranks of right as that of its greatest theologian, its most steadfast character, and the most of a born leader engaged in it—was something less of a pure man of letters than either Keble or Newman. But he was a man of letters; and perhaps a greater one than is usually thought' (p. 360).

'The publication of *The Christian Year* . . . probably did more for the movement and for the spiritual life of England than any office-holding could have done; and in 1831 Keble, being elected Professor

of Poetry, distinguished himself almost as much in criticism as he had already done in poetry' (p. 363). 'It is certainly not too much to say that it was impossible for Keble not to make everything that he wrote, whether in verse or prose, literature of the most perfect academic kind, informed by the spirit of scholarship and strengthened by individual talent' (p. 364).

Of Newman it is said—

'He was distinctly deficient in the historic sense' (p. 368). 'He was perhaps the last of the very great preachers in English—of those who combined a thoroughly classical training, a scholarly form, with the incommunicable and almost inexplicable power to move audiences and readers' (p. 368).

Mr. Saintsbury regrets that Newman did not devote himself to journalism, as having just the qualities for it (p. 369). Few readers, we hope, will endorse his estimate of Liddon as 'a popular and pleasing, though rather rhetorical than argumentative or original, preacher' (p. 369), but his criticism of Pattison and Jowett (p. 374) is much fairer. In the last chapter Mr. Saintsbury appears to be somewhat pessimistic in regard to the results of the whole period of literature (1780-1895), except about its poetry and its fiction; he sees the danger of the growth of periodicals as giving a distaste for serious reading; he considers that the theological literature has deteriorated, and that the character of the sermon has been weakened, but he recognizes the great advance in Church history and Biblical scholarship (pp. 456-7); nor is he sanguine as to the future; 'we are now too "literary"' (p. 466): we read to criticize, not to learn.

1. *The Elizabethan Clergy, and the Settlement of Religion, 1558-1564.*

By HENRY GEE, B.D. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.)

2. *Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops of the Anglican Church.* By

F. O. WHITE, M.A. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1898.)

THE Elizabethan era was perhaps the most glorious period in the history of our nation, but it was very far from being so in the history of our national Church. Considering the number of great names in almost every department of life—poets, statesmen, lawyers, philosophers, soldiers, sailors—which belong to the last half of the sixteenth century, it is wonderful how few really great names of Churchmen there are; you can almost count them on the fingers of one hand; while the general level, so far as religion was concerned, was certainly below, rather than above the average. 'The Elizabethan Settlement' or 'The Settlement of Religion' is a quite correct expression in one sense, but very misleading in another; for the Church can scarcely be said to have been in a more settled state—that is, so far as the establishment of its true position went—when the great queen died than when she came to the throne. Nevertheless, the Elizabethan was decidedly an important era in ecclesiastical as well as in civil history. If the Church was not finally 'settled,' she was at any rate gradually feeling her way towards a settlement, under the new and unsettling conditions in which she naturally found

herself, after her final break with Rome; and the *bases* of her settlement must undoubtedly be sought in Elizabethan history. We may therefore welcome any work which throws light upon a period so unsatisfactory in itself, but so necessary to be understood, if we would really know the processes by which the Church of England came to be what she is.

1. The first work which we have placed at the head of this notice fulfils this condition in a marked degree. Mr. Gee's simple object, stated in few words, is to ascertain how the clergy—bishops and 'inferior clergy' alike—were really treated at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. He restricts himself rigorously and precisely to six years: that is, from Nov. 17, 1558, the day of the queen's accession, to Nov. 17, 1564. He proceeds quite calmly step by step, and shows, to our mind most convincingly, that during those six years there was nothing like persecution; that, even when the penal laws were tightened, as they were in 1563, they were not rigorously enforced; and that out of 9,400 clergy, very many of whom were more or less disaffected, not more than a mere handful—two or three hundred, were deprived. So far from being a violent partisan, Mr. Gee, if anything, seems to us to err on the other side. For instance, it is putting it very mildly to say that 'Watson, bishop of Lincoln, came under the queen's displeasure within the first month after her accession, because of his *incautious*' sermon preached at the funeral of Mary on December 14, 1558' (p. 30). In the first place is not 'Watson' a mistake for 'White'? Mr. Gee is so generally well informed that we feel it almost presumptuous to hint that he has made a blunder. But assuredly it was Bishop White, not Bishop Watson, who preached the *famous* sermon at Queen Mary's funeral. The two men run so much together in couples that it is easy to confuse them; but we think Mr. Gee will find that it is Bishop White to whom he refers; and if so, he might have used a stronger term than 'incautious.' The sermon was on the suggestive text, 'Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive' (Eccles. iv. 2), and the preacher, having burst into tears in the midst of his panegyric of Queen Mary, recovered himself, and uttered this very equivocal anticipation about Elizabeth: 'She has left a sister to succeed her, a lady of great worth also, whom we are now bound to obey, for *melior est canis vivens leone mortuo*; and I hope so shall reign well and prosperously over us; but I must still say with my text, *laudavi mortuos magis quam viventes*, for certain it is *Maria optimam partem elegit*.' A less fiery and arbitrary spirit than Elizabeth might have been justly offended at such innuendoes, which were surely worse than 'incautious.' Mr. Gee stops at the year 1564 because, as he justly observes, the Vestiarian controversy then began to occupy the whole field of vision, while the Roman controversy was quite in the background until 1570, when it again came to the front under quite new conditions. In spite of assertions to the contrary, it seems to us idle to deny, in the face of obvious facts, that the Romanizers were from 1570 regarded as traitors, and

¹ The italics are ours.

treated as such, so that the question became a purely political question. Mr. Gee's scholarly style, his reasonableness, his perspicacity, and his admirably systematic arrangement of his facts, lists and documents are beyond all praise. If we once began to enter into details, we should soon be carried far beyond the limits of a Short Notice. We must therefore be content to recommend the volume cordially to the careful attention of our readers, and, at the same time, to express a hope that Mr. Gee will continue his labours. There are yet nearly forty years of the great queen's reign which he has not touched. If he treats them in the same way as he has treated the early years, he will have done great service to the student of Elizabethan history.

2. Comparisons are proverbially odious ; but it is difficult to help making a comparison between the work of Mr. Gee and that of Mr. White. Mr. White tells us in his Preface that 'nearly every book bearing on the subject [of the Elizabethan bishops] has been carefully read, and, when necessary, used ; but the material employed has been largely taken from manuscripts which have either never been printed or, if so, seldom come in the way of the general reader.' We do not doubt it : but such material requires sifting and weighing ; and this process Mr. White does not appear to have gone through. He seems to us far too ready to accept any testimony that comes to hand, especially if it tells against an Elizabethan bishop. He also forgets the Horatian dictum : 'Omne supervacuum pleno de pectore manat.' A very large proportion of the seventy-six bishops of whom he writes might well have been left in the obscurity from which they never emerged in their lifetime ; and it is quite hopeless to expect the ordinary reader to take any interest in them. Again, we are quite ready to admit with Mr. White that Queen Elizabeth was a Church-robber of a most glaring type ; that she treated her bishops with an insolence that was intolerable, and that she was singularly deficient in what the Germans call *Religiosität*. But we also maintain—what would never be gathered from Mr. White's pages—that her intellect was so keen and cultured that she saw far more clearly than any of her advisers, lay or clerical, what the true position of the Anglican Church was, and that she and Matthew Parker—who, according to Mr. White, was 'not perhaps a great Archbishop' (p. 60)—were nothing less than saviours of that Church, which, without them, would have been in the greatest danger, either of relapsing into the Roman obedience, or of degenerating into a mere Puritan sect.

SERMONS.

1. *Cambridge and other Sermons.* By FENTON J. A. HORT, D.D., &c. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1898.)
2. *The Spiritual Standard, and other Sermons.* By WALTER HOBHOUSE, M.A. (London : Rivington, Percival, and Co., 1896.)
3. *The Perfect Life.* Sermons by W. J. KNOX-LITTLE, M.A. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898.)
4. *The Catholic Gospel ; a Series of Plain Sermons.* By G. WINGFIELD HUNT, B.A. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1898.)
5. *The Tree of Life.* Plain Sermons on the Fruits of the Spirit. By H. J. WILMOT-BUXTON, M.A. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1898.)
6. *For Christ and the Truth.* By H. J. MARTYN. (London : Williams and Norgate, 1898.)
7. *Sermons and Addresses.* By W. C. WHEELER, M.A. (London : James Parker and Co., 1897.)
8. *The Kingdom of Heaven, here and hereafter.* By RAYNOR WINTERBOTHAM, M.A., &c. (London : Methuen and Co., 1898.)

AN audacious thought, which we almost shrink from putting into words, flashed across us as we were perusing some of these sermons. The badness of modern sermons is a stock subject of complaint nowadays. From time to time the complaint finds an utterance in letters to the newspapers, some suggesting a remedy, others merely airing a grievance, but all agreeing that preaching is not what it should be. Now is it possible that this unsatisfactory state of things may in some cases arise because sermons are too good, not because they are too bad? because they rise above, not because they sink below, the level of the hearers? At the first blush of the thing it may seem impossible. What ! in these days of Board schools, higher grade schools, University extension, and competitive examinations for everything ; when the schoolmaster is very much abroad in every nook and corner of the land ; when daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly periodicals abound, and when the name of books on all conceivable subjects is Legion, can it be that people are not sufficiently educated to appreciate an ordinary sermon? Yes ! in spite—perhaps partly in consequence—of all these *fin-de-siècle* privileges, we *do* believe that some of the sermons in the batch before us (and these are, no doubt, only types of many more) are above, rather than below, the apprehension of very many hearers. It is not meant that the average hearer would not understand the meaning of the words or the general drift of the sentences ; but it *is* meant that the preacher stands on a higher plane—thinks differently, takes a different standard from that of the average hearer. Let us turn for a moment from the pulpit to the railway bookstall, and reflect what is the mental *pabulum* provided there. Of course there are the great standard works, and the great standard periodicals, which are fit for the highest intelligence ; but what is the calibre of the general mass of literature which is provided in such endless variety and such rich abundance? It is, of course, regulated by the law of supply and demand ; for we cannot

suppose that the purveyors of this class of literature are actuated by a missionary spirit, and put forth their wares to elevate the taste or instruct the minds of their patrons; they simply supply what is demanded; so the article provided may be taken as a fair index of the popular taste; and, judged by this standard, is the popular taste a very delicate or fastidious one? Take a bundle of sermons and a bundle of this kind of literature at haphazard. Which would rank highest from a purely literary point of view? The contrast is forced upon us when we turn to the volume which we naturally put first and foremost (as it ranks in every way) in this notice.

1. Is it possible to conceive that the same mind which is satisfied, say, with *The Pink 'Un*, *Tit Bits*, *Sketchy Bits*, &c., for its week-day food, would be at all satisfied with the late Dr. Hort's *Cambridge and other Sermons* as its Sunday food? Can we not fancy the reader of the former writing indignantly, if not grammatically, to the newspapers about the dryness, the dullness—perhaps, if he put his own thoughts in his own language, 'the bosh'—inflicted upon him by the latter? You might as well expect the admirer of the latest music-hall ditty to be also the admirer of Mozart's *Twelfth Mass*. Dr. Hort represents the very perfection of Cambridge culture, as Dean Church represented the perfection of Oxford culture; and we should never be surprised to learn that hearers have been 'bored' both by Dean Church and Dr. Hort. Uneducated hearers would pronounce them slow—not enough 'go' about them; the 'superior person,' *alias* the prig (for the race is not extinct) would think them too simple. There is, indeed, a studied simplicity in Dr. Hort's sermons; but they are perfect of their kind, and it has been a real intellectual treat to read them. They are even more interesting than the *Village Sermons* which preceded them; for they show the workings of a great mind in its relations to various classes of society—the fresh young intelligence of the undergraduate, the matured culture of the college 'don,' the half-educated classes which compose the bulk of our town congregations, and the purely uncultured rustic. Dr. Hort does his best to adapt himself to each in turn, but we doubt whether he would ever be regarded as a popular preacher. His thoughts are too refined, his style too pure, his matter too full for that. As an illustration of the last point take his remarkable Christmas sermon entitled 'The King expected and found' (composed, it is true, for a university audience). Why, there is matter in it for at least ten ordinary sermons. And in his sermons preached at St. Ippolyts, with all their beauty, there is painful internal evidence of the struggle so graphically described by his biographer:

'It was in the production of sermons that this difficulty of finding expression for his thoughts was most felt. It seemed as though the message which he longed to give lay too deep in his own heart to be uttered aloud. The subject of a sermon was generally chosen early in the week. It was thought over perpetually, and towards the end of the week he began to write; but he had hardly ever finished before the early hours of Sunday morning, and he would often sit, hour after hour, pen in hand, but apparently dumb, till the words came at last, sometimes in a rush' (*Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, i. 360).

Some of the results of these painful efforts, made by one of the most highly cultured minds in England simply for the benefit of a few poor rustics, we have in this deeply interesting volume. It would be a presumption even to praise it; but we may heartily thank Mr. F. A. Hort for the privilege of reading it, and we may heartily commend it to our readers.

2. Mr. Hobhouse's volume is something of the same type as Dr. Hort's. It consists of twenty-one sermons preached, some before the University of Oxford, some in college chapels, and some to the schoolboys at Durham. These sermons, too, bear traces of being the composition of a cultivated scholar, and, though plain and simple in their language, without any ornament or attempt at eloquence, would, we venture to think, hardly be appreciated, though they might perfectly well be understood, by an average congregation. They do not, like Dr. Hort's, follow the course of the Christian year. They begin, oddly enough, with Trinity Sunday, go on to Ascensiontide; then, after two or three sermons on general subjects, proceed to Lent, while Advent does not come in until the thirteenth sermon. Might we suggest that in another edition a rather more Church-like order might be desirable? There is, however, a good Church tone about them, and we can confidently recommend the volume to the thoughtful student.

3. We next have a volume of a very different type, written by one who is deservedly one of the most admired preachers of the day. These particular sermons are not of inordinate length; but we know from experience that Canon Knox-Little can hold an audience spell-bound for a length of time, which is rare indeed in these degenerate days, when the brisk little sermonette of the period is quite enough from the ordinary preacher. In this respect he has sometimes reminded us of the great preachers of the seventeenth century. But these—Barrow, South, Jeremy Taylor, and the rest—can hardly have been better to hear than they are to read. We cannot say quite the same of Canon Knox-Little. There is a story told of a preacher who submitted his manuscript sermon to a keen critic, who returned it saying: 'The first time I read it I liked it extremely; the second time, not so well; the third time, not at all.' 'You forget,' replied the preacher, 'that the people will only hear it once.' Taking this common-sense view of the matter, we ought not to be disappointed with the sermons printed here under the title of *The Perfect Life*; but certainly, judged merely as literary compositions, they rank far below those of Dr. Hobhouse, and immeasurably below those of Dr. Hort. It is a question whether great preachers act wisely in submitting their sermons to be read in print in cold blood; at any rate it would be ungracious to criticize a preacher whom we have so often admired. It is needless to say that the Canon's trumpet gives no uncertain sound; he is a strong, indeed a very advanced, Churchman, but thoroughly loyal to the English Church. We quite agree with him in his preference for the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.; and regret, as much as he can, that it was suffered to be mauled about in deference to the rather impertinent objections of foreigners who had

really no right to interfere. But it should be remembered that what Canon Knox-Little calls 'the miserable Prayer Book of 1552' (p. 341) not only 'never had the authority of the Church' (p. 344), but never was in general use in England at all. Again, an expression in p. 342 seems to imply that 'the Savoy Divines' had mainly to do with the revision of 1661. But it is not to the Savoy Divines, but to a far more important and regular body, the Committee of the Upper House of Convocation, that we are indebted for our Prayer Book as it stands; and, most of all, to that great liturgiologist Bishop Cosin, who knew more about the subject than all the rest of the Committee put together. If Cosin's advice had been taken on all points, many more alterations would have been made, all in the direction which Canon Knox-Little indicates. However, quite enough was done to enable English Churchmen to be loyal to their national Church; and, in spite of senseless and unwarrantable clamours to the contrary, we believe that Canon Knox-Little and those who agree with him are at least as loyal as, if not very much more so than, many who are raising a hubbub against them.

4. Mr. Wingfield Hunt's sermons on *The Catholic Gospel* are of the same type as Canon Knox-Little's, and are, like them, more suited for oral delivery than for print. They are very earnest, spirited, and definite; and though, like Canon Knox-Little, the writer undoubtedly represents 'the advanced guard' of the English Church, there is not the slightest ground for accusing him of being disloyal to that Church, though we can well believe that some will accuse him of being so. He modestly tells us in his Preface that he is a 'new author'; and though there is no reason for him to fear that his coming into the field will be regarded as 'an impertinence,' perhaps, as a new author, he will not think it an impertinence in us to offer him a few suggestions. 'An eclectic minority' (p. 3). Is not this rather an odd expression? 'Eclectic' has come to mean one who picks out certain points and constructs from them a jumble of his own. But the context shows that our author means, not this, but what is generally termed 'elect.' To emphasize his perfectly correct assertion that 'it is facts that you and I want, facts to set against other facts, divine facts to answer to human facts,' he tells us 'We live in a universe of phenomena' (p. 5); but surely 'phenomena' are, properly speaking, *opposed* to facts; they are simply appearances. 'What is her cogent, forceful plea?' (p. 8). Is not this tautology? 'Cogent' and 'forceful' are respectively the latinized and the English word to express precisely the same idea. Again, on p. 9, does he mean to imply that Laud's Arminianism was really the cause of his judicial murder? and that, so soon after all the Laud commemoration literature has appeared? And does he really think, as he seems to imply on p. 19, that John Wesley's scheme was 'in subordination to parish churches'? The great founder of Methodism had many virtues, but subordination to proper authority was surely not among them. And what authority has Mr. Hunt for speaking of 'the hunted expression' (p. 22) and 'the haggard and drawn countenance' (p. 34) of the Blessed Saviour? But if we go on at this

rate
ha
con
earn
time
style

but
Wili
is st
con
Euc
it, h
Wit

it is
His
we a
arms
near
ther
disti

Hou
more
leges
Wili
that
surro

bapt
as th
thing
them
are n
dwell
Baal
party
religi
221-

to ill
and
idea
serm
Tree
seria
we h
the
noth

rate, a long article, not a short notice, will be required, for we have hardly gone beyond a tenth part of the book. We must therefore be content with heartily welcoming a new author, who is evidently an earnest, consistent Churchman; suggesting, however, at the same time, that he should pay a little more attention both to matter and style when he again appears before the public.

5. Our next volume, *The Tree of Life*, is not by 'a new author,' but by a very old hand—and a very good one, too, in its way. Mr. Wilmot-Buxton, though far less advanced than the two last noticed, is still a good Churchman of the old-fashioned type. We frankly confess that we should like to have had the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist put more prominently forward, but when he does refer to it, he is perfectly sound on this, as on other Church principles. Witness the following passage:

'When we bring a child to be baptized, we are perfectly certain that it is born again of water and the Holy Spirit, that God has received it as His own child by adoption, and incorporated it into His Holy Church; we are perfectly certain that Jesus has taken the child into His loving arms, and that the Holy Spirit has come to dwell in him. When we draw near to the altar of the Blessed Sacrament, we *know* that Jesus is present there, that He comes to us veiled in the Sacrament, that He says to us as distinctly as to the first Apostles, 'Take, eat, this is My Body' (p. 212).

The whole of the sermon which bears the happy title of 'The House Beautiful,' borrowed of course from John Bunyan, but far more correctly applied, is a sound, simple description of the privileges a Christian enjoys as a member of the visible Church. Mr. Wilmot-Buxton is also admirably outspoken in his condemnation of that invertebrate Churchmanship which is entirely dependent upon its surroundings.

'Be ye steadfast in the *principles of the Church* into which you were baptized. Some people seem to change their religious principles as often as they change their clothes. They are Churchmen one week and something else the next. If they take service with a Churchman, they call themselves Churchmen and communicants. If they live with those who are not Churchmen, they change their principles. Such people, if they dwelt in the house of a priest of Baal, would sacrifice in the temple of Baal. We have no respect or confidence for the politician who joins one party one day and another the next. So it is impossible to believe in the religion of those who are "everything by turns and nothing long" (pp. 221-2).

The passages we have quoted for another purpose will also serve to illustrate the plain but pure style in which the sermons are written, and the earnestness and good sense which pervade them all. The idea of the book is a happy one. Taking for the text of his first sermon Rev. xxii. 2, Mr. Wilmot-Buxton makes the fruits which the Tree of Life bore to be the Fruits of the Spirit, which he dwells upon *seriatim* in the sermons that follow. The more sermons of this sort we have published the better. They are simple enough to be within the grasp of the meanest understanding; while there is absolutely nothing in them to which men of the highest intelligence might not

listen with profit and pleasure. Mr. Wilmot-Buxton has caught the true 'art of concealing art'; and while we are not at all sure whether their extreme simplicity, which is in truth one of their great merits, might not bring him under the lash of our typical complainer, we are quite sure that the fault would lie with the hearer, not with the preacher.

6. Very unlike Mr. Wilmot-Buxton, Mr. H. J. Martyn is rather too ambitious in his aim. To discuss within two hundred and thirty-three short pages in a controversial tone such vast subjects as Christology (in itself more than enough to fill the volume); the nature and composition of the Four Gospels; the doctrine of the Trinity, with its difficulties and their explanations; the evidences of a Future State; St. Peter's supremacy (involving the whole Roman question); the Holy Eucharist, treated controversially; the authorship and date of the Epistle of St. James, and various other by-subjects, would be a task beyond the powers of the greatest master of theology, however much he might condense his matter. But instead of condensing, Mr. Martyn is rather apt to be diffuse; and his style is too often complicated and involved. For example:

'If the death of Christ was thirty years or rather more before this [A.D. 64], it will be noted that he [Tacitus] not only mentions it with unquestioning confidence as a historical fact, but that the persecution of the Christians points back to it, if, indeed, it does not demand it; and what is perhaps even more decisive is the intimation that Pontius Pilate was the then Roman governor at Jerusalem, for this is not only a most striking confirmation of the historic value of the Gospel narrative containing the trial scenes, but it is at the same time of distinct evidential value itself, forasmuch as it was well-nigh impossible for the crucifixion of Jesus to have occurred during Pontius Pilate's procuratorship—seeing how far-reaching and in all respects tremendous were the issues which thence arose, including as they did the uplifting of the Crucified as no less than the world's hope, amid the temples, art, and philosophic schools of Rome itself, and failing not to draw to Him, as if by magic, disciples ready to live and die for Him, perchance alike from the Forum, the barracks, and even the imperial household, many of them remaining steadfast, though they were sewn in the skins of wild beasts and flung to the dogs, or besmeared with wax and pitch and, while bound to sharp poles, set on fire to illuminate the imperial gardens—without attaching itself to his name and giving it a prolonged remembrance' (pp. 3-4).

One's breath is taken away by such a sentence! But at any rate there is no ground in this volume for the common complaint against sermons, that there is nothing *in* them.

7. Mr. Wheeler's *Sermons and Addresses* are not unlike those of Mr. Wilmot-Buxton; there is the same simplicity, perspicacity and directness about them, and, unlike Mr. Martyn, he deals with manageable subjects. But he leaves much to be desired in the way of Churchmanship. *Eccē signum!* Six sermons, occupying nearly a hundred pages, deal with the subject of 'Worship'—that is, public worship; and yet only one short page is allowed to the Holy Communion, and in that page it is treated in the most jejune and perfunctory fashion. Nevertheless we are thankful to receive from one

of our
Christi-
spiritu-
Mr. W.
the m-
'Litu-
print,
views

8.
mark-
but, a
parab-
(after
head.
Parab-
duces
dom
are tr-
doubt
in eve-
and a
Edinb-
is not
certain-
ventic-
precon-
To give
Parab-

...
of the
Parab-
and th-
anywh-
due to
thing :
get so-
thing :
He lay
story'
this ou-
sure :
'the m-
no hint
and bo-
ing on,
objecti-
parable
whom w

This id-
of the

VOL.

of our Low Church brethren a warm testimony to the value of the Church's system of services from Advent to Advent, and to the spirituality and appropriateness of the Church's prayers. The more Mr. Wheeler enters into the spirit of that system and of those prayers, the more surely will he learn to value her highest service—her true 'Liturgy'—and we cannot but hope that when he next appears in print, he will be found to have imbibed fuller and higher sacramental views.

8. We have reserved to the last what is perhaps the most remarkable book of all. It is not, strictly speaking, a book of sermons, but, as each section has for its heading one of our Blessed Lord's parables, which—or rather one aspect of which—is then explained (after a fashion), it may be regarded roughly as coming under that head. The parables which Canon Winterbotham selects are 'The Parables of the Kingdom'—that is, those which our Lord introduces with the words 'The Kingdom of Heaven [or The Kingdom of God] is like,' &c. These are fifteen in number, and they are treated in order in rather startling fashion. The book is undoubtedly able, suggestive, and original, furnishing food for thought in every page. Moreover, the writer is evidently a sincere believer and a sound Churchman. His position as a Canon of St. Mary's, Edinburgh, would lead us to assume this; and the assumption is not really belied by anything which his book contains. But he certainly treats his subject—well, to put it mildly, in a most unconventional way; and what he writes is calculated to unsettle the preconceived ideas of many; in fact, this seems to be his intention. To give a few instances. Our Blessed Lord's interpretation of the Parable of the Sower 'adds nothing whatever to our understanding. . . . We should have been able to interpret the good seed, the birds of the air, the thorns, the shallow soil, for ourselves' (p. 32). In the Parable of the Tares 'there is a deliberate confusion between the *seed* and the *people* in whose hearts the seed is sown. . . . If it were anywhere else, we should certainly say it was confusion of thought, due to careless and inaccurate mental processes. The seed is one thing: it is confessedly the word of the kingdom. The people who get sown with the seed, who profit or do not profit by it are another thing: they are confessedly the hearers of the word' (pp. 37-8). He lays great stress on the fact that the characters in 'the earthly story' are not in themselves held up for our imitation, and works this out in startling detail. Thus in the Parable of the Hid Treasure:

'the man "hid" the treasure found, *i.e.* he kept his discovery back, gave no hint that the field was anything better than its neighbours; bid for it, and bought it in a casual, careless way, as though he wanted it for building on, or to make a brickfield of. That was odious—or at least was objectionable. And there is not anything more noticeable in our Lord's parables than His entire indifference to the moral character of those whom we might call the "heroes" of His stories' (p. 79).

This idea he works out in detail in many parables. In the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard 'the householder's plea, that it was

lawful for him to do what he liked with his own, is untenable now, whatever it was then.' 'He is capricious and unjust' (p. 126). In the Parable of the King's Supper 'our Lord never used in His teaching any piece of imagery more frightful than this of the man without a wedding-garment. The horribleness of it might really be considered gratuitous if it were not His. . . . The action of the king, indeed, in this matter is, on the face of it, arbitrary and passionate' (pp. 139, 140). In 'The Rich Man and Lazarus :'

'The story is designedly clothed in the crudely materialistic language current among the Jews, because it is directed against Jewish covetousness and Jewish superstition. God is not referred to in the story. Father Abraham is the "divinity" of the piece. No Christian can by any possibility accept the theology which is implied in it, because it is simply the theology of a debased Judaism which looked no higher than to "Father Abraham" for hope of good things in the life to come' (p. 157).

In the Parable of the Ten Virgins :

'From the point of view of the Gospel they [the wise virgins] are distinctly worse than the others. The only fault charged against the foolish virgins is "foolishness," want of foresight, carelessness. The wise virgins are simply wise in their own interests ; they are selfish and hard-hearted. They decline to part with any of their oil, for fear they should not have enough left for themselves ; they get rid of the importunity of their sisters by sending them to buy oil at the shops—in the middle of the night !' (p. 167).

Finally, in the 'Parable of the Drag Net :'

'There is another thing which we cannot avoid seeing, strange and uncomfortable as it is. The fishes within the net are neither better nor worse than those outside. They are, as it says, "of every kind." Broadly speaking, they only differ from the rest of their kith and kin by the fact (with all that depends upon it) of being within the net. Christians at large are no better and no worse than the rest of mankind, except so far as the fact of being Christian and under a certain pressure of Christian opinion has affected them for good. It is useless to pretend to ourselves that it is otherwise. The average of human character is singularly level through all the great religions of the world, Christianity included' (p. 105).

These extracts, it will be admitted, are sufficiently startling. Nevertheless we believe the book is an honest attempt to discourage injudicious interpreters from tampering with the eternal and immutable laws of morality, and on the principle that the *Advocatus Diaboli* is a useful functionary, we do not think that it ought to be hastily condemned.

AI
of
Amra
Jew
Arch
con
Car
his
Arc
Let
476
Car
may
per
of t
poir
Hea
form
liev
of I
of t
doc
Zwi
the
that
'the
rece
gift
Eng
othe
'the
to th
of th
that
stow
befo
state
and
479
opini
of 't
mon
481
prop

INDEX TO VOL. XLVII.

ALE

ALEXANDER, Archbishop (Armagh), *The Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, 509
 Amram, Mr. D. Werner, *The Jewish Law of Divorce*, 262
 Archbishops, the two, on recent controversies (the Archbishop of Canterbury's *Charge delivered at his First Visitation*, and the Archbishop of York's Pastoral Letter on *The Present Distress*), 476 *sqq.*: the Archbishop of Canterbury here speaks as Primate of All England, 477; his personal judgment on the value of the Prayer Book, *ib.*; on other points he explains, as official Head of the Church, the different forms of teaching which he believes to be lawful in the Church of England, *ib.*; his statement of two opposing opinions on the doctrine of the Eucharist: the Zwinglian (which is not that of the Church of England), and that of those who believe that 'the Sacrament conveys to the receivers a special mysterious gift' (to which the Church of England is committed), 478; another division of opinion: (a) that 'the Real Presence is attached to the Elements from the moment of their consecration,' and (b) that 'the Real Presence is bestowed in the reception, and not before,' 478 *sq.*; criticism of the statement that both views, (a) and (b), are lawful in the Church, 479; the Archbishop of York's opinion, *ib.*; Dr. Temple's view of 'the Lutheran doctrine commonly called Consubstantiation,' 481; his statements on 'the proper objects of worship and

ARC

prayers for the dead,' *ib.*; Dr. Maclagan's statement on the same subject, 482; opinions of both Archbishops on 'the practice of Confession,' 482 *sq.*; criticism of some points, 484; Dr. Temple's treatment of 'uniformity in ceremonial,' *ib.*; Dr. Maclagan on the same subject, 485; on external marks of adoration of the sacred Elements, 486; the subject of the use of hymns, *ib.*; both Archbishops condemn the ceremonial use of incense, *ib.*; criticism of Dr. Maclagan's statement that 'the use of incense in any form was certainly unknown in the primitive Church,' 487; the Archbishops' treatment of the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, *ib.*; the use of 'additional services,' 488; Dr. Temple on 'the power of the bishops': 'coercive jurisdiction,' and the episcopal veto, 489; the Archbishop of York on the obligation of 'priests and deacons to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer,' 490; the observance of Holy Days and Seasons of the Christian year, 491; answer to the objection 'If all this which the Archbishops have stated is true, the Church of England is only a compromise,' &c., 492; the real meaning of the Church's toleration of divergencies, *ib.*; the advance in doctrinal belief in recent times calls for thankfulness and congratulation, 493; appeal of the Archbishop of York to the spirit of self-sacrifice which may be shown in the obedience of the clergy to constituted authority, 494; the force of such an

ARN

appeal may be diminished if a minority of the bishops continue to act and speak in the future as they have done in the past, 494; the time is full of anxiety, but also of hope, 495

Arnold, Thomas and Matthew, and their Influence on English Education (by Sir Joshua Fitch, in the 'Great Educators' Series), 466 *sqq.*: points of contact and resemblances, but great differences, in the temperaments and characters of father and son, 466; estimate of Sir J. Fitch's work, 466; Thomas Arnold's reformation of the spirit of our public school system through his position at Rugby, 467; good effects of early training of boys in responsibility, 467 *sq.*; the social organization of Arnold's school, 468; basis of his educational system, *ib.*; how he utilized the various class lessons for his object, 469; Arnold's share in the religious controversies of his time, 470; his Church principles, *ib.*; the career of his son, Matthew: his early education, 471; how his circumstances acted on the development of his genius, *ib.*; like his father, he tried to educate his generation, *ib.*; work as Inspector of Schools, 472; his literary work: on religion his teaching was in the name of a God whom he knew only as 'a stream of tendency, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness,' 472 *sq.*; exaggerations of his gibes on the vulgarity of English taste, 473; his share in the credit of raising the popular taste, *ib.*; *Friendship's Garland*, *ib.*; his catchwords: 'Philistines,' 'Barbarians,' 'sweetness and light,' *ib.*; Matthew Arnold's supreme canons of criticism, 474; his poetry: it excels that of his chief contemporaries in intellectuality, 475; both father and son left their marks on the England of their day, 476

COP

BAYLISS, Sir Wyke, *Rex Regum*, 524
Beeby, Rev. C. E., *Creed and Life*, 257; *Reply to the Attack of Earl Beauchamp*, 532; his bishop's duty with regard to him, 533
Bigg, Rev. Dr., *The Imitation of Christ*, 265
Blass, Professor Friedrich, *Philology of the Gospels*, 243

CAMPBELL, Rev. D., *Hymns and Hymn Makers*, 522
Chaucer, Geoffrey, The Works of (Globe Edition: ed. A. W. Pollard, &c.), 530
Church Reform, 219 *sqq.*: the cry for Disestablishment replaced by that for Church Reform, 219; reasons for this change of attitude, 220; the *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church* (edited by Canon Gore): their main line of argument, 221; their plan, and general character, 222; the essays of Mr. Rackham and Lord Balfour, 223; Mr. Justice Phillimore, Mr. Sturge, 224; Canon Gore, Canon Scott Holland, 225; Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Torr, 226; Mr. De Winton, the Dean of Norwich, Dr. Fry (headmaster of Berkhamstead), 227; two main purposes in the demand for Church Reform: Canon Gore's catalogue of abuses to be removed, 226; Mr. Sturge's list of *reformanda*, 230; criticism of the Appeal of the Church Reform League, 230 *sq.*; the proposed reform of the Convocations, 231; the formation of Houses of Laymen upon a representative base, and with legal powers, 232; objections to the scheme, 233; important points omitted from it, 236; reforms suggested as alternatives, 237
Clayton, Rev. H. E., *The Spiritual Needs of Oxford*, 514
Coptic Gospels, the (Mr. Horner's *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*), 38 *sqq.*: the 'Coptic' language, 38; comparison of the

CRI

three dialects, 36; slow progress of Christianity in Egypt: Roman persecutions, 40; new era: St. Pachomius, 41; probable date of the Coptic translation of the Bible, *ib.*; source of the Sahidic version, 42; some remarkable interpolations in it, *ib.*; character of the Bohairic version, 43; the Middle Egyptian version, *ib.*; the Clarendon Press edition of the Bohairic version: admirable work of the editor ('G. H.'), 44; some criticisms: mistranslation of Coptic roots which have each various meanings, 45; disastrous consequences of always translating a word in the same manner, 47; abuse of italicised words, 48; objection to the treatment of the tenses of the Coptic verb, 49; general appreciation of the translator's work, 49 *sq.*

Crisis, The present, in the Church of England, 1 *sqq.*; the aims of Mr. Kensit's party, 2; character of the newspaper correspondence on the subject, 3; Bishops of Southwell and Gibraltar on Confession, 3 *sqq.*; the 'pronouncement' of the Lambeth Conference of 1878, 4; Dr. Pusey's rejoinder, 5; position of the Church of England stated by the Rev. H. E. Hall, 6; Canon Gore's view on the practice of Confession, 7; Canon Newbolt on the Church's use of the term 'Absolution,' 8 *n.*; the teaching of our Lord ignored by the objectors to Confession, 9; distinction between 'Confession' and 'Direction,' 10; the opinions of the Bishop of Southwell criticized, *ib.*; its alleged 'moral dangers,' 11; the anxiety caused by the Protestant war against doctrines and practices which have great authority in the Church, 12; need of a secure basis for the future: consolidation and order desiderated, 13; the wondrous growth of Catholic doctrine and ceremonial in the last sixty years, 14; an undeni-

DAL

able chaos in the conduct of the services of the Church, 15; examples of the treatment of the service of Morning Prayer, *ib.*; the Holy Sacrifice should hold the chief place in our worship, 16; extraordinary irregularities, 17; examples of 'tinkering,' 19; Bishop of Hereford's opinion of 'ritualistic enthusiasts and anarchists,' 20; the obligation of daily saying the Morning and Evening Prayer, 21; meaning of 'a reasonable hindrance,' 22 *sqq.*; the liberty allowed of using services other than those in the Prayer Book, 24; Sir W. Harcourt's argument from this, and Lord Stanmore's reply, 25; Bishop of Winchester's opinion, 26; limitations of the 'jus liturgicum' of the bishops, 27; the Church must keep pace with the demands of the age, but with care and deliberation, 29; a rigid uniformity deprecated, 29 *sq.*; examples of unnecessary use of 'additional collects' and 'additional services,' 30; remedy suggested, 31; neglect of the rubrics of the Catechism, 32; grave present responsibilities of the Bishops: 'regulated local option' repudiated, 33; 'loyal conformity' the present need of the Church, 35; interference of Parliament deprecated, 36; forebodings as to the action of the Bishops, 36 *sq.*

DALE, Dr., of Birmingham (the *Life by his Son*), 354 *sqq.*: excellences of the work, 354; its method, 355; sketch of Dr. Dale's life: how he gained the high position of respect in which he is held by Birmingham, 357; appreciation of the views of those from whom he differed, *ib.*; relations with distinguished Churchmen, 357 *sq.*; appreciation of Pusey and the Tractarian Movement, 358 *sq.*; his entire acceptance of the principles of Congregationalism, 359; relation to

DAV

Sacramental truth, 360; his lectures on the Atonement, 361; views on pastoral visitation, *ib.*; his political and municipal activity, and educational policy, 362; his dogmatic teaching, 363; his answer to the question, 'For whom does the word "God" stand?' 364

Davies, Rev. J. Ll., *Spiritual Apprehension* (Sermons and Papers), 521

Deaconesses, the early history and modern revival of, 302 *sqq.*: the changes in meaning of the word 'deaconess,' 302; works on the ancient office, 303; Deaconess Cecilia Robinson's *The Ministry of Deaconesses*, 304; in the New Testament women-deacons are recorded, 305; Deaconess and Widow not synonymous; the status of widows, 306; they were sometimes grouped with consecrated virgins, 307; early history of the office of deaconess: no evidence of its existence in the West for first four centuries, 308; traces of it in Egypt in third century, 309; in the East: the *ministra* of Pliny (*Ep.* xcvi.) were deaconesses, 311; evidence from the *Didascalía*: status and work of the deaconess, especially in the administration of Baptism to women, 311 *sq.*; the *Apostolic Constitutions*, 312; she is here in *minor* orders, 313; many deaconesses mentioned by name, 314; they gradually became 'ruling women,' displacing the *presbytides*, 315; later, 'deaconess' became a synonym for 'abbess,' 316; their 'ordination' gradually ceased, *ib.*; Synod at Nîmes (A.D. 394) repudiated the ordination of deaconesses, 317; the practice of their ordination yet crept into Gaul, though frequently forbidden by canons of Councils, 318; deaconesses in Italy: statement of Cassiodorus, 320; ninth and tenth century references to the office as a thing of the past, 321; references to

EAR

deaconesses at Rome, and in other cities of Italy, 322 *sq.*; confusion, again, of 'deaconess' with 'nun,' and especially 'abbess': Abailard's account of the office, 324; the final stage: the blessings of a nun and the ordination of a deaconess merged into one idea, 326; in modern times: the deaconesses of the *Unitas Fratrum* and their descendants the Moravian Brethren, 327; other sectarians of the Reformation period: the Mennonites, the English Puritans, 328; the Independents, 329; the Quakers, and the later Non-jurors, 330; Dr. Fleidner and the Kaiserwerth institution, 331; differentiation of the Protestant 'deaconesses': Elizabeth Fry's institution in Devonshire Square, 333; the origin and development of the 'Mildmay Missions,' 333 *sq.*; the growth of English episcopal sanction and supervision of these institutions, 334; the 'Suggested Rules' of 1871, and the 'Resolutions' (1891) of the Convocation of Canterbury, 335; the approval of the institution in Lambeth Conference of 1897, 336; the position of the modern deaconess not that of a new Order, 337; examples of forms of admission to the office, 338; her tenure of the office, 339; an anomalous position, 340; no right to the title of 'Sister,' 341; amendments suggested, *ib.*

Driver, Rev. S. R., D.D., *The Parallel Psalter*: being the Prayer Book Version of the Psalms and a New Version arranged on opposite pages, 498

EARLY Christianity, The History of (Mr. Leighton Pullan's work), 89 *sqq.*: Mr. Pullan's object and method, 89 *sq.*; treatment of opponents like Harnack and Renan, 91; condition of the world at the time of our Lord's birth, *ib.*; Jewish ideas concerning the Messiah, 92; the start of

the
Ac
and
St.
95
anc
age
atu
sor
of
St.
con
99
for
tial
pos
sec
of
of
Ma
bra

GA
ture
Gay,
of
and
Gee,
Cler
ligi
Gesem
edit
E. K
Rev
by
Goulb
Lor
Guyon
(tran
an il
path
face
Guy
com
182
and
a st
aspi
worl
the
186
band
187
'The

GAR

the City of God on its career : Acts of the Apostles, 93 ; writings and teaching of St. Paul, 94 ; St. John and the Church of Asia, 95 ; the Paschal festival, its date and object, *ib.* ; Roman policy against the Christians, 96 ; literature of the immediate successors of the Apostles, 97 ; summary of their teaching, *ib.* ; Rome and St. Peter, 98 ; different modes of conducting Christian apologies, 99 ; the Virgin birth of our Lord formed part of the earliest Christian belief, 100 ; Gnosticism, 101 ; position of the four Gospels in the second century, 103 ; the question of Holy Orders, 104 ; chief matters of Christian worship, 105 ; Justin Martyr's description of the celebration of the Eucharist, 106

GARDNER, Professor E. A., *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, 267

Gay, Monseigneur Charles (Bishop of Anthédon), *The Religious Life and the Vows* (trans. O. S. B.), 529

Gee, Rev. H., *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion*, 537

Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*, as edited and enlarged by Professor E. Kautsch (translated by the late Rev. G. W. Collins, revised &c. by A. E. Cowley), 501

Goulburn, (the late) Dean, *The Lord's Prayer*, 510

Guyon, Madame, *Autobiography of* (trans. Mr. T. T. Allen), 180 *sqq.* : an illustration of morbid spiritual pathology, 181 ; Mr. Allen's preface criticized, 181 *sq.* ; Madame Guyon's conception of man as composed only of soul and body, 182 ; her birth, delicate health, and joyless childhood, 183 *sq.* ; a strange precocity in religious aspiration, with relapses into worldliness, 185 ; her estimate of the grace of prayer given her, 186 ; her marriage, *ib.* ; her husband and his uncongenial home, 187 ; her sudden realization of 'The Kingdom of God is within

HUG

you,' 187 *sq.* ; her passion for suffering, 189 ; exceptional ability in business matters, 190 ; earthly trials, 191 ; a painful stage of spiritual experience, 192 ; complete self-renunciation, 193 ; 'a road of death and of faith,' 193 *sq.* ; her relations with Father La Combe, 195 ; her domestic life and charity, 196 ; leaves France to work for the New Catholics at Geneva : her troubles thereafter, 197 ; her conception of the Nirvana of the soul, 197 *sq.* ; the state of spiritual maternity, 198 ; Fénelon and Bossuet's opposite opinions about Madame Guyon, 199 ; illustrations of her central thought, 200 *sq.*

HEADLAM, Mr. Cecil, *Prayers of the Saints*, 242

Helbeck of Bannisdale (Mrs. Humphry Ward's work), 135 *sqq.* : character of the work, 135 ; the story, 136 ; descriptions of natural scenery, 137 ; causes of the painful impression the book leaves upon the mind : indefinite treatment of religious questions, 138 ; the character of Stephen Fountain, 140 ; his daughter (the heroine), a 'little pagan creature,' 141 ; Mrs. Ward's description of the process and outcome of the Roman Catholic system in England, 142 ; Helbeck's character, 143 ; a specimen of Roman Catholic teaching of children, 144 ; Helbeck's sister, 145 ; the priests in the book, 146 ; a Jesuit in embryo, 147 ; the female devotees, *ib.* ; representatives of the Anglican Church, 148 ; a slight glance at Methodism, 149 ; Dr. Friedland, 149 *sq.*

Hobhouse, Rev. W., *The Spiritual Standard, and other Sermons*, 541

Hort, Rev. Dr., *Cambridge and other Sermons*, 540

How, Mr. F. D., *Bishop Walsham How*, 511

Hugh, St., of Lincoln (translated, &c., by Herbert Thurston, S. J.), 526

HUN

Hunt, Rev. G. Wingfield, *The Catholic Gospel: a Series of Plain Sermons*, 542

IMMORTALITY, *The Hope of*, (by Dr. Welldon, now Bishop of Calcutta), 202 *sqq.*: aim of the work, 202; value of the belief in immortality, 203; the highest type of sanctity cannot exist without it, 204; how far its practical value is a sound argument in defence of the truth of the belief, 205; definition of immortality, 206; theory of 'conditional immortality' rejected, 206 *sq.*; the resurrection of the body, 207; the foundations of this belief, 209; the argument for immortality 'from the constitution of the universe,' 210; the question of the immortality of the lower animals: views of Bishop Butler and Dr. Newman, 211; Dr. Welldon's opinion, 211 *sqq.*; punishment and reward in the future life, 215; prayer by the departed for the living, and by the living for the departed, 216; some criticisms on the work, 217; the Christian amplification of the belief in immortality, 218

Invocation of Saints, 273 *sqq.*: recent condemnation of the practice, 274; definition of the phrase, *ib.*; difference of 'comprecation' and 'invocation,' 275; the continuous Christian belief that the departed are in a state of consciousness, *ib.*; evidence from the early Church: Liturgy of St. James, 276; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Origen, 277; St. Gregory of Nazianzus, 278; St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Chrysostom, 280; St. Ephraem the Syrian, St. Ambrose, 281; St. Augustine, St. Jerome, 282; an objection met, *ib.*; how the saints have knowledge of such supplications, 283; the limitations of the practice, 284 *sq.*; who may be invoked? 286; practice of the Eastern Church, 287; two authoritative statements: the Council

KEN

of Trent, 288; the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church*, 289; English Church statements on the invocation of saints: in the 'Ten Articles' of 1536, 289; in the 'Bishops' Book' (1537), 290; in the 'King's Book' (1543), 291; saints invoked in the Litany in 1544, *ib.*; these invocations omitted in later revisions, 292; meaning of the condemnation in the present Article, 292 *sqq.*; and of the words 'Romish doctrine' in it, 294; the three things thus done: removal of all invocations of saints from service books, 295 *sq.*; condemnation of custom of seeking from saints gifts which can be bestowed only by God, 296; the limited form of invocation which asks the saints for the help of their prayers left an open question, 297; an objection founded on the prohibition of dealing with the dead in the Old Testament, 297 *sq.*; the Church's action in this matter in accordance with Catholic theology and practice, 299; rash statements and sweeping condemnations on this question to be equally avoided, 300 *sq.*

Irish Liber Hymnorum, *The* (ed. J. H. Bernard and R. Atkinson), 250

JEAFFRESON, Rev. H. H., *The Holy Eucharist* (Sermons), 267

KEBLE, Rev. John, *The Christian Year* (ed. Rev. W. Lock), 265
Kenotic Theory, *The* (work by Dr. Hall, of Chicago), 342 *sqq.*: 'kenoticism' contrary to Holy Scripture, 342; many degrees of error embraced, 343; contradicts historical Christian beliefs, 343 *sqq.*; Canon Gore's objection to the 'juxtaposition of the consciousnesses in our Lord,' 344; doctrine of St. Leo and the Fathers, 345; destructive effect of 'kenotic' theories on the

KNO

Atonement and the ethical value of our Lord's life, 346; the truth of the divine immutability, 348; Dr. Hall's interpretation of *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*, 349; kindred interpretations of Bishop Pearson, Dr. Bright, and the Bishop of Oxford, 350; the 'kenotic' interpretation inconsistent with the context of the words, 352; Dr. Hall's summary of his 'reasons for rejecting the kenotic theory,' 353

Knowles, A. C., *Turning Points*, 266
Knox-Little, Rev. W. J., *The Perfect Life* (Sermons), 541

LANG, Mr. Andrew, *The Making of Religion*, 244

MAHAFFY, Professor, *A Survey of Greek Civilization*, 270
Martyn, Rev. H. J., *For Christ and the Truth*, 544

McCormick, Rev. Canon, *What is Sin?* (Sermons preached before the University of Oxford), 266

NEWBOLT, Rev. Canon, *Priestly Ideals*, 253

PARADISO, Studies on the (Mr. E. G. Gardner's *Dante's Ten Heavens*, and Mr. Hasel-foot's *Chiosa Dantesca*), 151 *sqq.*: the intellectual framework on which Dante's Ten Heavens are constructed, 154; the Scholastic method of reconciling philosophy and religion, 155; difficulty arising from the cosmogony of the Schools, 156; the Neoplatonist conception of *Causa primaria*, and the emanation of the first *anima nobilis*, 157; Scholastic philosophy substitutes Creation for Emanation, 158; the creation of natural objects and the *virtù* which informs them, 159; the Stellar Firmament, the seven planetary spheres, and the Primum Mobile: through these the divine *virtù* reaches the earth, 160; the *ψυχὴ* extended by Dante to the vegetable world,

PEN

161; Dante's cosmology, 162; the nine Angelic Orders of the Schoolmen, 163; criticism of Mr. Gardner's division of the ten heavens, 164; his paraphrase of *Par. xiii. 52 sq.*, and of the end of the seventh canto, 166 *sq.*: fanciful interpretations, 168; allegorical significance of Dante's temporary blindness, 170.—Mr. Hasel-foot's *Chiosa Dantesca* (on *Par. xiii. 52-87*): Dante's tenets on 'immediate' and 'mediate' creation, 173; *résumé* of the poet's argument, 174; the creation of the angels, 175; basis of Mr. Hasel-foot's exegesis, 177; other interpretations, *ib.*; those of Scartazzini and Mr. Hasel-foot rejected, 178 *sq.*; what is believed to be the right interpretation submitted, 179
Paulicians, Mr. F. C. Conybeare and the (his edition of *The Key of Truth*), 365 *sqq.*: Mr. Conybeare's theory: 'Unitarians are a survival of the old Adoptionist Church,' 366; doubtful statements and contradictions, 367; his attempt to show that Adoptionism was the primitive Armenian faith, 368; arguments from doctrine in fourth and fifth centuries, 369; St. Basil, 370; the Armenian Smbat's followers (A.D. 719) called 'Paulicians,' 372; doctrines of the *Key of Truth*, 373; Paulicians' use of New Testament, *ib.*; their Christology (Adoptionism), 374; treatment of baptism, fasting, and the Eucharist, 375; denial of the Atonement, 376; celebration of the birth and baptism of Christ, 377; observance of the Paschal festival, and the Agape, 379; Mr. Conybeare's views on Adoptionism in the Apostolic age, 381; in the second century (a) Palestine, 383; the *Didaché*, 384; (b) Asia Minor, 385; (c) Rome, 387; the doctrine in *The Shepherd* of Hermas, 389 *sqq.*
Pentateuch, The Criticism of the, 50 *sqq.*: good effects of Dr.

PEN

Baxter's reply to Wellhausen, 50; his work carried on by Professor Green of Princetown: attack on the literary stronghold of the critics, 51; origin of his work on *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 52; its object, 53; its main argument: against the theory of a *Grundschrift* with supplements and the Documentary hypothesis of Hupfeld, 54; Dr. Green's method, 55; the medley offered us by the critics as their Pentateuchal scheme, 56; its unstable foundation: no proof that E, J, D or P ever existed, 57; Dr. Green's second work, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 58; the evidence for the Mosaic authorship, *ib.*; arguments from: the traditional belief of the Jews, 59; exemplified in the New Testament, 60; testimony of historical books of the Old Testament, 61; what the Pentateuch itself says as to its authorship: the Book of the Covenant, the Ritual Law, the Deuteronomic, 63; the history: the victory over Amalek, 64; the stations of Israel during the wanderings, 65; rejection by the critics of passages which negative their theory, 66; Dr. Green's argument from the language of the laws, 67; the Pentateuch alluded to and its existence implied in the subsequent books, 69; argument from the theological development of Israel, 70; Wellhausen's arguments: the Evolution theory, 72; the Israelites could not have produced such a work as the Pentateuch, 73; but the evolution desiderated had already taken place, 75; the life of Moses in Egypt and in Midian, 76; what follows from the assumption that he wrote the book of Genesis there, 76 *sq.*; his expurgated rendering of the polytheistic stories of Creation, of Paradise, and of the Flood; Wellhausen's theory of the evolution of religion, 79; Dr. Green's refutation of the

REE

alleged composite character of the Pentateuch, 80; the supposed agreement of the critics as to the lines of the division, 81; pitfalls which beset the critics, *ib.*; the rôle of the Redactor, 83; the alleged inconsistencies and contradictions in the Pentateuch, 84; Dr. Green's partition of a parable after the manner of the critics, 86

Phillimore, Miss C. M., *Dante at Ravenna: a Study*, 517

Pigou, Dean (Bristol), *Phases of my Life*, 515

Polychrome Bible, *The*: Part III. *The Book of Leviticus* (ed. Paul Haupt &c.), 238

RAMSAY, Prof., *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* 502
 Reeve, Henry, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of* (by Mr. J. K. Laughton), 406 *sqq.*; Mr. Laughton's definition of his aims, 407; exaggeration of Reeve's influence in politics and literature, 408; another defect: the work does not portray its hero, 406; the 'origins' of Henry Reeve: equipment for the battle of life, 410; distinguished friends of his youth, 410 *sq.*; Privy Council clerkship, 411; close connexion with Tocqueville and Guizot, 412; political mission to France, 413; his knowledge of France, *ib.*; Guizot and the Spanish marriages, 414; the revolutionary movement of 1848, 415; Reeve's connexion with the *Times*, 416; Lord Clarendon's objection to that paper's attacks on Louis Napoleon, 416 *sq.*; Reeve's views on the responsibility of journalists, 417; Guizot's sketch of the character of Napoleon III., 418; Reeve the exponent of Lord Clarendon's political views, 419; editor of *Edinburgh Review*: estimate of his alleged 'vast influence' over the literature of his time, 419; his 'Church politics,' 420; noteworthy *obiter dicta* of Guizot in the work, 421

REG

sq.; Reeve's opinion of Gladstone, 422; Lord Derby's *mot* on Earl Russell, 423; Circourt's estimate of Prince Bismarck, *ib.*; general appreciation of Reeve, 424
Regulations, The, of 1860 regarding the use of Government Churches for Presbyterian Worship, and the Revised Regulations of 1898 by which their use was extended to Wesleyans (Official Document), 495; breach of trust of the Government of India, 498

Rendall, Mr. G. H., *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to Himself*, 271

Rickaby, Rev. J., *Notes on St. Paul: Corinthians, Galatians, Romans*, 240

SACERDOTALISM, 424 sqq.: test question as to the meaning of the word 'sacerdotalism,' 425; criticism of Mr. Harris's *The Claims of the Priesthood considered*: it ignores important Scriptural evidence, 426; especially that contained in Luke xii. 42, 428; exegesis of the passage, *ib.*; appreciation of Mr. Lepine's *The Ministers of Jesus Christ*, 428; treatment of the subject in Dr. Bright's *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*, 431; summary of the argument by which he proves that Christ did institute a ministry, 432; the position of the primitive laity, 433; the application of Sacramental principles in the early Church, 434

Saintsbury, Mr. G., *A History of Nineteenth-Century Literature* (1780-1895), 533

Secondary Education, 392 sqq.; objects of the Secondary Education Bill promoted by the Head Masters' Conference and other bodies, 393; present provision for Secondary Education, 394; the Government's proposed 'Board of Education' Bill, and 'Teachers' Registration Bill, 396 sq.; details and criticism of the Head Masters' proposed

THO

Bill, 399; the religious question, 401; the liberty of conscience provided for by the recent Vaccination Act must be extended to our system of elementary education, 402; a definition of Secondary Education desiderated before the schools can be supplied, 403; treatment of schools conducted for private profit, 404; the proposed Teachers' Registration Council, 405
 Selborne, Earl of, *Letters to his Son on Religion*, 248

Serious Call, A (Canon Overton's edition of William Law's work), 453 sqq.: intrinsic value of the work, 454; its influence upon John and Charles Wesley, *ib.*; on Whitefield, Venn, and Thomas Scott, 455; Dr. Johnson's opinion of it, *ib.*; Gibbon's testimony, *ib.*; Law's letters against Hoadly, *ib.*; the *Serious Call* esteemed by Keble, 456; valued by Newman, *ib.*; by Hurrell Froude and Charles Longue Higgins, *ib.*; answer to objections brought against the book, 457 sq.; analysis of its materials, 458; force and pungency of Law's humour, 459; examples of his portraiture, 460; some specimens of his apophthegms, 460 sq.; account of the 'Series' in which this edition is published ('The English Theological Library'), 461 sq.; features of the best English theology, 462; value of Canon Overton's Notes to the *Serious Call*, 463; some omissions and errors of the editor, 464; the Gospel basis of Law's work, *ib.*

Soames, Mr. W. H. K., *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*, 246

Somerville, Rev. D., *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, 507

Sursum Corda (arranged by W. H. Frere and A. L. Illingworth), 508

TARBELL, Mr. F. B., *A History of Greek Art*, 269

Thomas of Canterbury, St., 435 sqq.: the unparalleled reputation, in life and after death, of Thomas

TOM

Becket : number of churches dedicated to him, 436 ; Erasmus's description of his shrine, 437 ; his memory was one of the foundations of English literature : the *Canterbury Tales*, 438 ; parentage and early life, 439 ; chancellor of Henry II. : personal relations with the king, 439 *sq.* ; his life, external and internal, 440 ; made archbishop : contest with Henry, 441 ; its cause, 442 ; Becket in exile : reconciliation with Henry, triumphant return, 443 ; his murder, 444 ; Dr. Abbott's work on the relation of the Becket history to the criticism of the Gospels, 446 ; summary of his arguments, 447 ; similarity of the Gospel miracles and those attributed to Becket, 448 ; the documents recording the death and miracles of Becket, 449 ; the credibility of these miracles, 450 ; the character of St. Thomas, 452

Tomkins, Rev. H. G., *Abraham and his Age*, 509

WENLEY, Prof., *The Preparation for Christianity in the Ancient World*, 505

Wheeler, Rev. W. C., *Sermons and Addresses*, 544

White, F. O., *Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops of the Anglican Church*, 538

Wilkinson, Rev. J. H., *Four Lectures on the Early History of the Gospels*, 255

Wilmot-Buxton, Rev. H. J., *The Tree of Life*, 543

Winterbotham, Rev. Raynor, *The Kingdom of Heaven, here and hereafter*, 545

Wiseman, Cardinal, Ward's Life of, 107 *sqq.* : Wiseman's early years, 108 ; in Rome : his studies of the early Christian Church, 109 ;

WOR

achievements in Oriental literature : *Horæ Syriacæ*, 110 ; years of 'desolation,' and their effects, 111 ; his influence on the contemporary revival of the Roman Church, 112 ; visited, in Rome, by Newman and Hurrell Froude, 113 ; Wiseman in England : the *Dublin Review*, 114 ; his interest in the Oxford Movement, *ib.* ; embarrassment caused by the 'old Catholic' feeling of the English Papists, 115 ; made Bishop, and President of Oscott College, *ib.* ; his sketch of the theory of development in the Church, 117 ; article on St. Augustine and the Donatists, *ib.* ; his argument criticized, 118 ; letter to Newman on worship of the Saints and of the Virgin, 119 ; struggles amid which Wiseman's policy was carried out, 120 ; accession to the Roman Church of Newman and others, 121 ; meeting of Newman and Wiseman, and their after relations, 122 ; Wiseman's work in the London district, 123 ; made Cardinal, *ib.* ; re-establishment of the Hierarchy : 'Papal Aggression' panic, 124 ; aggravated by the tone of the Cardinal's pastoral, 126 ; result of his Appeal to the English people, 127 ; difficulties of his work of organization, *ib.* ; services of the new converts, 128 ; Wiseman's difficulties with religious orders in connexion with the service of the poor, 129 ; co-operation of Manning, 130 ; dispute with Archbishop Errington, 131 ; Manning vindicated from Mr. Purcell's charges, 132 ; letter of Manning's on the dispute, 133 ; Wiseman's last years and death, 134

Wordsworth, Miss E., *Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer*, 264

era-
ears
ects,
con-
man
ome,
ude,
the
erest
ib. ;
the
the
made
scott
the
the
St.
s, ib. ;
118 ;
ip of
119 ;
man's
120 ;
urch
121 ;
Wise-
tions,
the
made
ment
Ag-
vated
inal's
ppeal
diffi-
aniza-
new
diffi-
ers in
of the
Man-
Arch-
nning
rcell's
ning's
man's

chts on